Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BX 4917 .L6413 1884
Loserth, Johann, 1846-1936.
Wiclif and Hus

WICLIF AND HUS.

WICLIF AND HUS.

FROM THE GERMAN OF

DR. JOHANN LOSERTH,

Professor of History at the University of Czernowitz.

TRANSLATED BY THE

REV. M. J. EVANS, B.A.

London:

HODDER AND STOUGHTON,

27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCLXXXIV.

[*All rights reserved.*]

Printed by Hazell, Watson, & Viney, Limited, London and Aylesbury.

PREFACE.

THE present volume was originally designed to form an episode in a work on the literary opponents of the Hussite movement. But several circumstances, relating partly to the nature, partly to the ordering of the material, have induced me to give to it the form it now has. First of all was the conviction that the episode must needs acquire by far too great dimensions, though only a part should be communicated of the abundance of proof-passages such as appear below in the Second Book,—and the number of these passages, of which a selection only is here furnished, was constantly growing, as the result of a closer study of those works of Wiclif which have not yet issued from the press. Yet more weighty was the consideration that the present book deals with a question which, as will be perceived from the pages of the subjoined Introduction, must be designated a burning one; the solution of which, moreover, is earnestly to be desired, even in

the interest of other studies, *e.g.*, the editing of the texts of Wiclif and of Hus.

Of the two books under which the material is arranged, the first describes the soil to which Wiclifism was transplanted during the first years of the fifteenth century ; and then the diffusion of the same, at first tardy, and afterwards more and more intensive, in Bohemia and Moravia. That here an ample gleaning is still afforded, even for those parts which have been treated in the distinguished works of W. Berger and G. Lechler, may be rendered apparent in particular from the first chapters of this book. In order not to give a yet greater extension to the work, the general political and national state of affairs in Bohemia is only outlined in the presentation ; for this reason also the question of the controversy regarding the votes [in the University], and what is immediately connected therewith, has merely been touched upon. The Second Book affords the proof-passages for the employment of Wiclif's writings on the part of Hus.

As respects these proof-passages, they may be regarded as sufficient for the recognition, not only of the fact that the theology of Hus is identical with that of Wiclif, but also of the nature and character of the use made of Wiclif's writings by Hus.

Of the articles in the Appendix, No. VI. calls for

special attention. We discern from it how profoundly the religious movement of those days laid hold of all minds in Bohemia. The articles following show the wide diffusion attained by this movement, and the passionate hatred with which it was pursued on the side of the opponents. The written defences of a Simon of Tissnow, a Prokop of Pilsen, and a Zdislas of Zwerzeticz, moreover, are deserving of publication even on general literary grounds ; for they appear as the most excellent of that which was said on this subject in Bohemia and Moravia, and surpass in the point of originality and profundity with which they handle the same, the well-known writing of Hus himself. Of the articles in the Appendix only No. X. has heretofore been printed. The importance of the subject and the rareness of the print may justify the reprinting of it. That in Hussite circles great value was attached to this paper, is shown by its frequent occurrence in ancient MSS., and that in the Latin, Czechian, and German languages.

As respects the orthography, alike in the texts of Wiclif and in those of Hus, the spelling of the MSS. has been retained, and only where this fluctuates the ordinary one is chosen. Manifest errors of writing or geminations in the opening sound of a word, and the like, have been simply corrected without calling attention to the same. Otherwise the

number of notes would have been largely increased. Only in those Articles of the Appendix in which it was a question of philological accuracy have the emendations made in the text been indicated in the notes. Complementary additions in the text are placed within brackets.

In closing, it remains only for me to express my best thanks to the Directors of the University Library, and the Library of the Board of National Education at Czernowitz, Olmutz, Prague, and Vienna, and in particular to the President of the Vienna Palace Library, Herr Hofrath Dr. von Birk, for the furnishing of MSS., and other literary aids. He who is acquainted with the difficulties, to some extent insuperable, under which one labours in connection with libraries of entirely youthful existence, will comprehend how gladly one hails such assistance coming from without. If, nevertheless, I have not been able to avail myself of *all* the literature bearing on the subject, I may certainly reckon on the same consideration, which K. F. Th. Schneider once claimed for himself on the publication of the sixth volume of Neander's *Universal History of the Christian Religion and Church* (p. x): and yet Schneider was labouring in Berlin, and not in Czernowitz.

J. L.

CZERNOWITZ, 29*th June*, 1883.

NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.

An observation or two on the etymology of the English Reformer's name will perhaps be in place here. The name was variously written during the lifetime of this herald of the Reformation—sometimes appearing in more than one form even in the same MS.; but of these variations, nearly twenty in number, only *two* claim any attention in the present day. Of these the reading *Wiclif*, accepted by the best Continental authorities, and followed by our author, is already found in the State paper which relates to the Reformer's embassy at Bruges, anno 48 Edward III. (26th July, 1374), in which city, it may be incidentally mentioned, he was the intimate associate of the Duke of Lancaster. Supposing "Wiclif" to be the original form, the Anglo-Saxon "Wic" would enter into the composition of the word. But the analogy of the language would in this case require the "Wic" to be placed in the last syllable, instead of the first.

A notice in a diocesan register, belonging to the year 1361, when the Reformer was Warden of Balliol Hall, Oxford, reads "Joh. de Wyclif." Similarly, on his presentation to the living of Lutgersal, in the Archdeaconry of Buckingham (Nov. 1368), the entry reads, "Johannes de Wyclif" (see Vaughan, i. 272, ed. 2). Shortly after his return from Bruges he was presented by Edward III. with the prebend of Aust (Nov. 1375), and about the same time with the rectory of Lutterworth. An entry relating to his successor, at Lutterworth, contains the following: "Inquisitores dicunt, quod dicta Ecclesia incepit vacare ultimo die Decem. ultimo [*read* anni] præteriti per mortem Johannis Wycliff" (Vaughan, i. 346). The Ancient British "Gwy," or "Wy" (water), would thus seem to enter into the first syllable of the word. Wyclif (Cliff-water) is then the designation of the Yorkshire village whence the family name of our Reformer is derived. The name of the Bohemian Reformer was by himself written

Hus (abbreviated from Husinec) from the year 1396. The derivative *Hussite* may perhaps be allowed, as better according with the English mode of pronunciation than the form *Husite*.

Some exemplifications of Mediæval Latinity, to be met with in the following pages, may call for a word of notice. Such are the use of the indeclinable *Parisius* (pp. 43, 135, and *Appendix*), the general employment of *e* for *æ* and *œ*; the substitution of *c* for *t* before *i* (save when the *t* is preceded by *s*); the constant tendency to the accretion of *p* after *m*; and (as occurs also in writings of a later age) the omission of *c* before *t*; the reading *ewangelium*, etc. These peculiarities, found in MSS. written anterior to the revival of learning, present no serious difficulty, and are at the same time not without their philological interest.

It is hoped that the citations of Book II. are sufficiently full to enable the reader to discern that voice of pure truth, which, proceeding from Wiclif, has rung through the ages, and will yet resound, until all that withstands it shall have ceased to be.—It may be added that, for convenience of reference, I have introduced into the Index a few guiding dates, enclosed within brackets.

M. J. E.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

PAGE

Earlier and More Recent Opinions concerning the Relation of Hus to the Doctrine and Writings of Wiclif xv

BOOK I.

WICLIFISM IN BOHEMIA DOWN TO THE TIME OF ITS CONDEMNATION BY THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE.

CHAP.

i. Condition of Ecclesiastical Affairs in Bohemia in the time of Charles IV. 3

ii. The so-called Precursors of the Hussite Movement . . 21

iii. The First Controversy on the Lord's Supper . . . 53

iv. Wiclifism in Bohemia 64

v. Wiclifite Currents and Counter-currents during the years 1403—1409 88

vi. The Burning of Wiclif's Books 112

vii. The Controversy on Indulgences in Prague, of the year 1412 134

viii. Hus in Exile.—The Tractate concerning the Church.—Attempts at Union, and Eventual Triumph of Wiclifism 150

ix. Hus at Constance.—Condemnation of Wiclifism . . 164

BOOK II.

WICLIFISM IN THE WRITINGS OF HUS.

CHAP.		PAGE
i.	The Three First Sections of Hus' Tractate *De ecclesia*, and their Source.—The Doctrine concerning the Church	181
ii.	The Sections concerning the Head and the Members of the Church, in Hus' Tractate of the Church	193
iii.	The Doctrine of the Papacy and of the Power of the Keys, in the Dissertation concerning the Church	202
iv.	Other Sources of the Tractate *De ecclesia*, and of the Tractates against Palecz, Stanislas of Znaim, and the Eight Doctors	213
v.	The Tractate of Hus *De ablacione temporalium a clericis*, and its Source	225
vi.	The Tractate of Hus against the Papal Indulgence, and its Sources	236
vii.	The Tractate *De sex erroribus*, and its Sources	247
viii.	The Employment of other of Wiclif's Tractates by Hus	253
ix.	Wiclifism in the Last Writings of Hus	274
x.	Some Observations on the Hussite Doctrine in its Relation to Wiclif	280

APPENDIX.

i.	On the Number of Churches and Villages in Bohemia at the Beginning of the Fifteenth Century	295
ii.	Extracts from the Book of Visitation of the Diocese of Prague (of the year 1379)	295
iii.	On Konrad of Waldhausen	301
iv.	On Mathias of Janow	305

CHAP.		PAGE
v.	Notice having Reference to the Burning of Wiclif's Books .	307
vi.	The Defence of Certain Tractates of Wiclif, made by John Hus, Jacob of Mies, Simon of Tissnow, Prokop of Pilsen, Zdislas of Żwierzeticz, and John of Giczin . . .	308
	1. Jacob of Mies defends the *Decalogue* of John Wiclif	308
	2. Simon of Tissnow defends Wiclif's Tractate *De probacionibus proposicionum*	30
	3. Prokop of Pilsen defends Wiclif's Tractate *De ideis*	31 7
	4. Zdislas of Zwierzeticz defends Wiclif's Tractate *De Universalibus*	328
	5. Selections from the Defence made by John of Giczin	335
vii.	Concerning the Appeal of Hus to the Pope . . .	336
viii.	The Letter of Benessius Prædicator, to John Hus . .	337
ix.	Letter of Stanislas of Znaim to Katharina, Widow of Peter of Krawar, called, "of Plumnow"	339
x.	The Recantation of Peter of St. Clement	343
xi.	A Chronicler's Notice on the Ejection from the Windows (of the Town Hall) in 1419	347
xii.	The *Missa Wiclefistarum* (Invectives against the Wiclifites in Bohemia)	348
	SUPPLEMENTARY	354
	INDEX	359

PREFATORY NOTICE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION.

SINCE the days when I entered upon the composition of the following pages, one of my most cherished wishes has begun to receive its fulfilment. A society consisting of English and German scholars has taken in hand the publication of Wiclif's complete works. Already an important part of the same—the Latin Controversial writings—has made its appearance. When once these shall have been followed by those important works which form the *Summa Theologiæ* of the great English divine, every one will recognise how true and just was the complaint of Milton:—"If the stiff-necked obstinacy of our prelates had not obstructed Wiclif's sublime and exalted spirit, the names of the Bohemians, Hus and Hieronymus, and even of Luther and Calvin, would at this day have been buried in obscurity, and the glory of having reformed our neighbours would have been ours alone." J. L.

CZERNOWITZ, *5th January*, 1884.

INTRODUCTION.

EARLIER AND MORE RECENT OPINIONS CONCERNING THE RELATION OF HUS TO THE DOCTRINE AND WRITINGS OF WICLIF.

THROUGH many successive decades men were wont in Bohemia to designate JOHN WICLIF the fifth evangelist.[1] Even in the present day he is reckoned by the learned[2] among the four greatest schoolmen whom the fourteenth century possessed, and as sharing the palm with Duns Scotus, Occam, and Bradwardine. In truth Wiclif is one of the most original minds England ever produced, and the only properly so-called Reformer before the Reformation. Remarkably enough, he is pronounced a great philosopher, and to our philosophers his works are all but unknown. He is counted one of the most learned theologians of his age, and his tractates moulder in the dust. Almost all the works over which the educated world in our districts became intoxicated, are now forgotten, or at best are still shown in libraries as rarities. For Bohemia, every-

[1] Apology of John Pribram, *Geschichtschr. der hus. Beweg.*, ii. 140: "Et postquam temerarie hodie moderni plurimi sic volunt sentenciis omnibus Wikleph immorari et quasi *quinto ewangelistæ* inniti" . . .

[2] Shirley, *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*. London, 1858, LI.

thing that recals the name of Wiclif has a peculiar charm, for this name was for many years and decenniums the banner beneath which a powerful party fought its battles. That which Hus has deposited in the way of theological knowledge, in his various Latin tractates, he owes almost exclusively to the Englishman from whose writings he has, by diligent study, derived it.

During the last years of his life, Hus in reality appears as a genuine Wiclifite; with such verbal fidelity, and not seldom with so much *naïvete*, has he copied the writings of the Englishman. It was Wiclif's doctrine principally for which he yielded up his life; and did we not know that he played a part in other than purely theological matters, we should be obliged to confess that he mounted the pile on that 6th July of the year 1415 as an out-and-out Lollard.

To expound the relation between Hus and Wiclif under the guidance furnished by the writings of the one and the other,—not more than this,—is the task of the following study.

To the contemporaries of Hus this relation was not unknown, for they were either themselves still acquainted with the writings of Wiclif, and could compare them with those of Hus, or they received information about them from those who were familiar with the doctrine of the Englishman. Perhaps it was owing to the fact that this relation was pretty generally recognised—and Hus was certainly during the last years designated simply as a Wiclifite —that little has been written about it. On this account voices like that of the Englishman John

Stokes, who at the Council of Constance declared the doctrine of Hus to be pure Wiclifism, have remained quite solitary ones.

As acquaintance with the works of Wiclif decreased—and only in Bohemia did these continue to be read with reverence, subsequently to the Council of Constance—and Hussitism attained to the meridian height of its power, the personality of Wiclif as compared with that of Hus receded more and more into the background, and in the present day the Hussite doctrine is looked upon as, to a greater or less extent, original.

To what extent this is the case can be discovered only by a careful comparison of Wiclif's writings with those of Hus. The main difficulty of this labour arises from the circumstance that only a very small portion of Wiclif's works is as yet printed.[1] On this account alone has it been possible that such dissimilar and erroneous judgments should find expression regarding the true relation of the two Reformers towards each other.

If in this connection we first direct our attention to the earlier works on Bohemian history, we shall

[1] On this point, Gotthard Lechler has rendered the greatest services by his beautiful edition of the *Trialogus* (Oxford, 1869), and of the tractate *De officio pastorali*. As was to be expected of such a fine judge of Wiclif's writings, he is the only one who has hitherto attained to a more correct view of the true relation of Hus to Wiclif. For an edition of the tractate *De Christo et suo adversario Antichristo* (Gotha, 1880), we are indebted to Buddensieg. For our purpose an edition of Wiclif's tractate *De ecclesia* were most necessary; a complete edition of the *Summa Theologiæ* were hardly to be looked for just yet. (But see prefatory notice to the English edition.)

find in them, despite many errors in detail, on the whole a comparatively just view. Thus we may still perceive from ENEA SILVIO,[1] that in addition to the materials furnished him for his Bohemian history on the part of Bohemian and Silesian scholars, he had also before him authentic records of the Council of Constance, when he wrote those parts of his Bohemian history in which reference is made to this subject. On the whole, his fundamental conception is a right one. COCHLÆUS, too, is still in a position to say that the heresy of Wiclif was carried over from England[2]—where it arose, indeed, but attained no particular success—into Bohemia, where the Catholic doctrine suffered so great losses that it has never been able—Cochlæus writes in 1534—to recover from them. Not a few erroneous elements are to be met with in the works of HAJEK of Liboczan,[3] Zacharias THEOBALD,[4] as also in DUBRAVIUS.[5] Yet everywhere the influence of Wiclifism upon Hus and his companions is still depicted in strong colours. Dubravius traces all the misery which has broken in upon Bohemia to the knowledge of Wiclif's *Alithia*, by which he means the *Trialogus*. Similar also is

[1] *Historia Bohemica*, cap. xxxv.; comp. also 189, where Wiclif is placed immediately beside Rokycana; thus as entirely synonymous with Hus.

[2] *Historia Hussitarum*, 7: "Certe quod hæresis Wiclefi ex Anglia (ubi orta nunquam viguit aut prævaluit) in Bohemiam sub hoc rege introducta fuit."

[3] *Böhmische Chronik, übersetzt durch Sandel*, 647 *ff.*, 653.

[4] *Bellum Hussiticum* (*Francofurti*, 1621), 1 sqq. The letter of the University of Oxford, given by Theobald, p. 4, is manifestly interpolated.

[5] *Historiæ Bohemiæ*, xxiii., lib. 193.

the view of Balbin.[1] Pessina of Czechorod speaks of the Bohemian heresiarchs who were infected with the views of Wiclif's doctrine.[2] In after times a much lower estimate was formed of the influence of Wiclif upon the Bohemian movement, and such influence was by some altogether denied.

Thus there are to be found, even with Pelzel, whom we see in other respects pursuing critical methods, many quite erroneous assertions concerning the beginnings of the Hussite doctrine. Neither in his History of Bohemia, nor yet in his Life of the Roman and Bohemian King Wenzel,[3] does he give any hint as to the relation of Hus to Wiclif's doctrine. That which Hus taught, is held by Pelzel as altogether the intellectual property of Hus himself. Not much better does the matter stand in the chronological history of PUBITSCHKA,[4] who repeats in general the fabulous stories of Hajek of Liboczan; he makes mention, indeed, of Hus' labours for the diffusion of Wiclifian doctrines, and treats of Hus' doctrine, so far as this is contained in his tractate *Of the Church*, without, however, undertaking a comparison between the doctrinal system of Wiclif and that of Hus. Pubitschka looks rather upon the dogmas which Hus sets forth in the tractate on the Church as his own original views, and distinguishes them formally from those of Wiclif when he says: "It was far from the case that all were in duty

[1] *Epitome Hist. Bohem. ad ann.*, 1400.
[2] *Mars Moravicus*, lib. iv., cap. 4, 453.
[3] *Geschichte von Böhmen*, Prague, 1774, 214; *Lebensgeschichte des römischen und böhmischen Königs Wenzeslaus*, ii., 479 ff.
[4] *Chronol. Gesch. von Böhmen*, V. 2, 250.

bound to assent to *these* principles, any more than to those elsewhere laid down by Hus in accordance with Wiclif's opinions."

PALACKY in the last years of his life expressed himself on the subject after the following fashion:[1] To what extent it is true that the doctrine expounded by Hus was not his own, but the doctrine of Wiclif, I shall not endeavour to investigate, but shall leave it to theologians by profession to decide this. I confess I have never read Wiclif's writings, and it is difficult for me to overcome my aversion for all theological controversy. I know also that Hus made no claim to originality in his teaching; and that he was not concerned to say something new and as yet unheard of, but only to say very much that was true and salutary. Whether Wiclif's doctrine exerted an altogether over-mastering influence upon Hus, whether the latter attached himself unreservedly to Wiclif, are questions which hardly anyone could venture to answer in the affirmative.

In an earlier work[2] he had characterised Hus, it it true, as one of the most zealous champions of Wiclifian doctrines at the University of Prague, who even for a while showed himself hesitating on the question of the Supper. In general, Palacky thought he must rest entirely contented on this subject with the views of Neander and Böhringer.[3] In this way we are brought down to the labours of writers on General Church History.[4]

[1] *Die Geschichte des Husitenthums und Professor Constantin Höfler* (Prague 1868), 113.

[2] *Geschichte von Böhmen*, iii. 1. 190, 195, 198.

[3] *Geschichte des Husitenthums*, 113.

[4] The *Histoire de l'heresie de Viclef, Jean Hus, et Jeróme*

NEANDER is not disposed to rate very highly the influence of Wiclif upon Hus.[1] Much higher is his estimate of the influence of the writings of Mathias of Janow upon the theological bias of the Bohemian reformer. To what extent this judgment is well-founded, we shall be in a position fully to recognise only when the principal work of Mathias of Janow lies before us in a printed form. Thus much, however, may be already recognised from the specimens known to us of Janow's work "On True and False Christianity;"[2] namely, that the latter exerted by no means so lasting an influence upon Hus' theology as any one of the more important dissertations of Wiclif, for instance, that *De Christo et suo Adversario Antichristo*, which Hus adopted almost word for word into his principal work "Of the Church." It will rather be observed, that where Janow and Wiclif treat on similar subjects, Hus follows the leading of Wiclif, and not of his Bohemian predecessor.[3] Neander discovers in the principles of Janow the germ of the whole Reformational movement in

de Prague, Lyon 1682, is entirely antiquated, and contains erroneous data, on that point also which is now under review.

[1] See Neander, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Christlichen Religion und Kirche*, edited by Schneider, six vols., p. 317.

[2] As Palacky calls it. See the *Vorläufer des Hussitenthums in Böhmen*, new ed., Prague 1869, p. 51, cf. pp. 58-81. How little the standpoint of Mathias of Janow could content a man like Hus, has been admirably shown by Palacky himself, p. 126.

[3] Comp., *e.g.*, what Hus says, in perfect accord with Wiclif, on the *sufficiencia legis* (on the meaning of which expression see Lechler, *Johann von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation*, ii. 236), with the declarations of Mathias of Janow: "Quapropter in his scriptis meis per totum usus sum maxime biblia et ipsis cirographis et modicum de dictis doc-

Bohemia, and believes that he is not justified in coinciding with the judgment of those who ascribe to Wiclif's writings so very great an influence upon the development of the Reformational opposition to the hierarchy in Bohemia. But many propositions of Hus, in which it has been thought that echoes of Mathias of Janow are discernible, are taken direct from Wiclif. How little we can assent to the view of Neander, when he supposes that Hus agreed with Wiclif only in respect of that to which his reformational tendency, in following in the track of Mathias of Janow, had already led him, will be made apparent in the following pages. Even here, however, the remarkable fact must be noted, that so careful and accurate an explorer as Neander has not sought out the sources of Hus' most important tractates. At the very time when Hus is explaining the idea of the Church, he takes his starting-point not, *e.g.*, from Augustine, but from Wiclif. When Neander supposes that it was of special moment for Hus' course of theological development, that—in addition to the Bible, the old Fathers, and particularly Augustine—he had also known and studied the writings of a Robert of Lincoln, we have to observe that some of the authors whom Neander mentions were known to Hus, not from their own writings, but only from the arguments of Wiclif. This applies in the first line to Grossetête (Robert of Lincoln), but may likewise be shown to be the case with regard to other

torum." Let these passages be placed beside Wiclif, *Trial.* iii. 31, *De officio regis* (cited according to Lechler, *l.c.*, 473), and Hus, *De fidei suae elucidacione*, *Opp.* i. 49 *b*, and 44 *b*—48 *a*.

authors. By this we are far from intending to say that Hus had not himself, very diligently and with profit, perused his Augustine.

The statements of Neander were accepted by Krummel[1] without further examination. Krummel looks upon the Reformational movement in Bohemia not as an exotic plant, transplanted from without into that land, but as one which had its roots in that country and drew its vital force from itself. "The Council of Constance once regarded the so-called Hussite movement," he tells us, "merely as a continuation or as a sucker from the Wiclifite movement in England, and condemned it as such. This opinion, widespread as it has been to the present day, is refuted not only by the fact that Hus had acquired his Reformational ideas *in an entirely independent way*, and even before he was acquainted with the theological writings of Wiclif; but also, and chiefly, by the fact that a specifically Reformational movement was existing in Bohemia, at the very time when Wiclif's writings were hardly known beyond the limits of England, or at least not in Bohemia. It is demonstrable that his writings were diffused in Bohemia only within the last decennium of the fourteenth century, and during the first years of the fifteenth. They contributed essentially to an accelerated outbreak of the Hussite doctrine, but were not the impelling cause of its rise." How erroneous this judg-

[1] Krummel, *Geschichte der böhmischen Reformation im 15 Jahrhundert*, Gotha 1866; and his essay "Geschichtschreiber der husitischen Bewegung in Böhmen," in the 17th vol. of the *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1-40. For Krummel's views as to the relation of Hus to Wiclif, see p. 16 of the same; in the first mentioned work, pp. 99, 123.

ment of Krummel's is as a whole, and how perverted in its single parts, will be shown in detail further on. But what shall we think of his proceeding, when Krummel, without so much as attempting to subject the writings of Hus and Wiclif to a comparison, soars to the height of the utterly false assertion, that his life long Hus never gave in his adhesion to many important dogmas of Wiclif? Only afterwards, he maintains, the whole of Wiclif's doctrines obtained, through the influence of the Englishman Peter Payne, acceptance with a part of the Hussites.

The greatness of Wiclif's influence upon Hus was, moreover, accentuated quite sharply by Böhringer,[1] eight years before the work of Krummel. That with the condemnation of Wiclif as a heretic on the part of the Council of Constance, a decision was already reached in principle on Hus' cause and person, *previous to* any examination of him, is rightly maintained by Böhringer.[2] He discovers not a few points of analogy between the doctrine of Hus and that of Wiclif: "the sacred fire passed over from Oxford to Prague, and Prague continued the task which was withdrawn from Oxford"—a proposition which, it is true, does not apply; inasmuch as Hus on some few points, and notably on the doctrine of the Supper, did not abandon the path of the Romish Church, to enter for good upon that of Wiclif. Yet Böhringer has rightly characterised the peculiar tendency of Czechist professors in Prague—he designates them also the national Bohe-

[1] *Die Vorreformatoren des* 14 *und* 15 *Jahrhund.*, Pt. ii., p. 458; comp. particularly 604.
[2] *Ibid.*, 467.

mian Liberals—as pre-eminently Wiclifite. He has in several places made the remark, that Hus expresses himself "almost" in Wiclif's words.[1] The arguments advanced by Hus in defence of Wiclif's work on the Trinity, remind him of the justification of the "poor priests, as this is indicated by Wiclif; and of the manner in which the latter has defended the right of free preaching, in opposition to those who would bind the word of God."[2] That Hus derived whole tractates, or at least the leading arguments in the same, from Wiclif's writings, is a conclusion which Böhringer, however, did not reach. Even when he speaks of the Hussite explanation of the forgiveness of sin, he might have been able to observe that this explanation agrees verbally with that of Wiclif. He discovers only reminiscences of Wiclif, in a tractate which nearly throughout shines resplendent with the words of Wiclif. That King Sigismund, with his utterance, "Truly, I was yet young when this sect arose and began in Bohemia, and behold to what strength it has since then grown," alludes not, as Böhringer supposes,[3] to men like Konrad Waldhauser, Milicz of Kremsier, Mathias of Janow, and the so-called precursors of Hus, but has in view the Wiclifian doctrines themselves; will be comprehensible, if we consider the strictly Catholic standpoint which these precursors maintain.

Singularly enough, HEFELE in his History of Councils[4] did not enter upon an examination of

[1] *Ibid.*, 161, 277.
[2] *Ibid.*, 199; comp. further points of analogy, 233, 237, 257.
[3] *Ibid.*, 466.
[4] *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. vii., 1st Div., p. 28 *ff.*

the actuai state of affairs. He contents himself with observing that some perceive, in the acquaintance made with Wiclifism in Bohemia, "only a means of acceleration for the rapid development of the Hussite movement, while others rate much more highly the influence of Wiclif upon Hus." Although he analyses the material of Hus' tractate on the Church, yet he does not indicate by a single word the relation in which this tractate stands to the various writings of Wiclif.

CZERWENKA, likewise, has pretty fully adduced the religious views of Hus. Such doctrines, he says,[1] were indeed diametrically opposed to the traditional ordinances and dogmas of the Church, as these had been developed under the influence of Scholasticism and raised to the position of articles of faith. They must of necessity meet with rejection at the hands of the strict Church party; and, since Hus neither could nor would recal them, could only lead to a breach. We recognise in these doctrines the influence of his predecessors, specially of Janow;[2] even though Hus in many respects did not proceed so far as the latter;[3] but we find also "notes of accord with Wiclif's theology and the principles of

[1] *Geschichte der Evangelischen Kirche in Böhmen*, vol. i., p. 57.

[2] The defective fragments which have been published from his works hardly admit of our making a comparison. So far as we have undertaken this on the ground of MSS., no important influence of Janow upon Hus is to be traced.

[3] Precisely the opposite is the case. In no one of his writings has Janow passed beyond the limits of the prevalent Church. On the "Revocatio magistri Mathie" (Höfler, *Concilia Pragensia*), I may remark that in the MS. *de Janow* is wanting.

his philosophy." The principles of Janow, as Czerwenka thinks, would have sufficed in themselves alone for effecting the Reformation of the Church. That which is further observed as to the relation of Hus to the writings of Wiclif, offers nothing new. Hus, he tells us, had carefully investigated the doctrines of Wiclif, and had gradually given in his adhesion—if not to all the articles, at least to very many of them, and especially to their main scope and tendency. "From the tractate on the Church, the controversial writings against Palecz and Stanislas of Znaim, and a work on Simony, Hus' doctrines are best to be recognised." That in all these treatises only the polemic element can be characterised as the property of Hus, has been overlooked by Czerwenka; that he designates Wiclif and Hus as Nominalists, is certainly to be regarded as a fancy of this author's.

Entirely erroneous data are to be met with in most manuals of ecclesiastical history; *e.g.*, in that of RITTER,[1] wherein works are ascribed to Hus of which he was demonstrably not the author, as likewise the date of the composition of others is wrongly indicated. Of Hus' main work, *De ecclesia*, it is asserted that truth and error are so skilfully interwoven in this dissertation that the mass of people must take the error for truth. The errors on the ground of which Hus was condemned as a heretic are signalised, it is true, by Ritter; the question, however, to what extent these really proceeded from Hus, has not been broached by him.

[1] *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, vol. ii., Sixth ed., edited by Ennen, p. 114*f*.

WESSENBERG[1] concedes far too wide a place to the precursors of Hus ; notably he has, like others, assigned much too great an influence to Mathias of Janow. He represents Milicz of Kremsier and Mathias of Janow as already discussing the necessity of restoring the cup to the laity. The influence produced upon Hus by the study of Wiclif's writings is, however, hardly touched ; and only faint allusions are made to the resemblance between the dogmas of Hus and those of Wiclif. The writings of the former are not examined with regard to their sources.

Although most of the writings of Hus, says Wessenberg, are stamped with the impress of the scholastic theology of his time, yet they have, for the greater part, a tendency deeply affecting the Church's life. Dogmatic teachings are here discussed, principally in respect of their influence upon practice, disposition, and conduct. Hus declaimed warmly against the degeneracy of the clergy, against the negligence in the proclamation of the Word of God, etc. Only incidentally is there found in Wessenberg a side-glance at an analogous activity of Wiclif. The attempt is made, indeed, to give an analysis of the Hussite doctrinal system, in accordance with Hus' tractate on the Church ; but that the doctrines of the Englishman essentially constitute this system, Wessenberg has failed to recognise. The conclusions in the works on Church History of L'Enfant, [2]

[1] *Die grossen Kirchenversammlungen des* 15 *und* 16 *Jahrhunderts*, ii. 121.

[2] *Gesch. des Hussitenkriegs*, i. 59 *ff.*

Royko,[1] Marmor,[2] and even of Tosti,[3] the learned abbot of Monte Cassino, are altogether uncritical. The book of the last-named, in its German adaptation by Arnold, rests entirely upon the authority of Helfert. Among the various monographs on Hus, therefore, that of Helfert is to be mentioned in the first place.

This rates the influence produced upon Hus by the writings of Wiclif exceedingly low; nay, in the sense we attach to it, such influence is altogether denied by Helfert. Men have been wont on various sides, says Helfert, to represent the rise of the Hussite movement in Bohemia as an event brought about primarily and originally by acquaintance with the writings of the Englishman John Wycliffe. Let us say[4] that the Reformational opposition which Wycliffe exerted, by his writings, and from the professor's chair, to the ecclesiastical order, was limited to his person and descended with him to the grave. The forementioned assertion, continues Helfert, must therefore antecedently awaken legitimate doubt; for it is difficult to comprehend how a doctrine which, in the very land of its birth, passed away without abiding consequences, should have been able to strike such deep roots and to attain to such fatal maturity upon another soil, to which it was transplanted as an exotic growth. Upon closer

[1] *Gesch. der allg. grossen Kirchenversammlung zu Kostnitz*, i. 13 *ff.*

[2] *Concil von Constanz*, 47. (The book of Hübler contains nothing to the point.)

[3] *Gesch. des Conciliums von Constanz*, adapted from the Italian by Arnold, p. 146 *ff.*

[4] *Hus und Hieronymus*, 34.

examination, therefore, that assertion falls into the category of the superficial *Post hoc, ergo propter hoc.* Nevertheless Helfert does not deny—and thereby he really overthrows in part his own view—that acquaintance with the dogmas of Wiclif contributed to a considerable extent to the outbreak and growth of the ecclesiastical movement in Bohemia. Without at the present stage entering upon a refutation of this view, we must at once remark that Hus' writings do not "display an acquaintance with the dogmas of Wiclif;" but in reality, some of them entirely and others for the greater part, form the exclusive property of Wiclif, and that there is no ground for speaking of a Hussite system of doctrine.

Helfert is of the opinion that, even though the works of the Oxford doctor had not become known among the magisters of the university of Prague, a division could not have failed to take place in the views on Church government and ecclesiastical order, as well as that kindling of the mighty conflict which was the inevitable consequence of such division. For those theses which had the most prominent part in promoting the defection of Bohemia from the ecclesiastical unity, such as the description of the Pope as Antichrist, the reforms in the participation of the sacrament of the altar, the attacks upon the secular possessions of the clergy, resounded already in the discourses of Milicz of Kremsier, and in the great work of Mathias of Janow, who already defended the partaking of the Lord's Supper under both forms.

It will be acknowledged that Helfert is right in supposing the precursors to have exercised a great influence upon their contemporaries; but yet they

did not upon any point forsake the ground of the prevailing ecclesiastical doctrine. If we look more closely we shall easily discover that the Antichrist of Milicz denotes something other than that of Wiclif and of Hus. Wiclif, in his writings, designated the Pope as Antichrist, and in this Hus followed him. Wiclif and Hus make, it is true, an important limitation in connection with this tenet, which as such is not to be overlooked. As concerns the reforms in reference to the participation in the sacrament of the altar, these also move entirely on Church ground: the Supper under both forms was in Bohemia defended by no one before the year 1414. The controversies regarding the Supper turned on the question of the frequent or even daily reception of the Communion. We are unable, therefore, to look upon that which was essential to the Hussite movement as already present in the labours of the precursors; but perceive this in the transplanting of Wiclify,[1] which arose in Bohemia in the moments most favourable to its development.

If any one will investigate the influence which the so-called "precursors" have exerted upon Hus, let him only make exploration of Hus' writings. Hardly are the precursors once mentioned there. Not one of their tenets has passed over into his works, though he has made whole tractates of Wiclif's his own. And not particularly strong would the personal

[1] This word is employed by the contemporaries of Hus, as well in Latin as in German: "Et tunc mox Wiclefia cœpit invalescere." *Geschichtschr. der hus. Beweg.*, ii. 73. Palacky, *Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte der Hussitenkriege*, i. 16: "That he may avoid 'Wiclefie.'"

stimulus appear to be which he owes to his precursors, for although these had spoken against indulgences—the rector of St. Martin's in the Old Town of Prague, in the year 1392, called the indulgence a deception[1]—yet in the same year Hus believingly parted with his last four groschen, in order to participate in the indulgence.[2] Hus' subsequent doctrine of the indulgence is that of Wiclif. Not a word in it has he altered.

Equally as in Bohemia was the soil prepared, in other lands of Europe also, a few years before the assembly of Constance, from which men looked for a Reformation. Nay, single individuals, as Peter d'Ailli[3] and Gerson, go much farther in their opposition to the evils prevailing in the Church, than do the Precursors. Like Wiclif, the former of these also asserted that not the Pope, but Christ, forms the foundation of the Church, and that every assertion which cannot be derived from Holy Scripture is foolish; and Gerson[4] certainly cherished as lofty conceptions of the office of the ministry as Wiclif did. The words of a Mathæus of Cracow against

[1] "Discurrebant dempto uno puta magistro Wenceslao dicto Rohle pro tunc plebano ecclesie sancti Martini maioris civitatis Pragensis, qui non indulgencias sed decepciones appellabat. . . ."—*Chron. univ. Prag.*, ad annum 1392.

[2] Assuredly impelled thereto by the "Precursor Stekna": "Et pro tunc magister Johannes Hus nondum presbyter deceptus frivole per tales exhortaciones in Wissegrado confessus, ultimos quatuor grossos quos habuit confessori assignando, non habuit nisi panem siccum ad manducandum, . . . qui tamen factus presbyter et predicator" (*i.e.*, after he had become acquainted with Wiclif's writings) "multipliciter doluit. . . ." *Ibid.*, ad anno 1392.

[3] Tschackert, *Peter von Ailli*, 17.

[4] Schwab, *Johannes Gerson*, 376.

the disorder in the Church are equally outspoken ; those of a Nicholas of Clemengis yet far more severe than those of Hus. The latter at no time preached so trenchantly against the vices of the clergy, as did Nicholas de Clemengis.[1] It is true the idea of reform was not apprehended by its Bohemian advocates in the same manner as in France ; and in this fact, together with the more extensive learning of the French theologians, is to be found the difference between the latter and the friends of reform in Bohemia, who were striving after the attainment of the same object.

FRIEDRICH[2] clearly recognised that Hus' doctrine was by no means original, but only a confession of "almost all" the articles of Wiclif. He contended that Wiclifism arose not as a complete system, but in the form of bold and self-contradictory assertions ; though at the same time embracing within itself an onslaught on the Church and its dogmatic presentments, the like of which had never existed before. "It belonged," Friedrich further says, "to the number of the greatest and most lasting movements in the intellectual domain, if not even of the greatest phenomena of the fourteenth century. It aimed in that time, calling so deeply for reform, at a Reformation, founded seemingly on the Bible and the early Church, but one which struck at the existence of the Church itself ; on which account it must of

[1] Von der Hardt, *Acta Concilii Const.*, I., pars. iii., capp 17, 18, 22, 32 and others.

[2] J. Friedrich, *Joh. Hus. Ein Lebensbild*, Division I., *Johann Hus, der Feind der Deutschen und des deutschen Wesens*, 13.

necessity also be condemned by the Church as uncatholic, if the latter was not to abandon its own self."

Of a *complete* system of Wiclifism, doubtless, we cannot speak, if we consider that Wiclif's opposition to the Mediæval Church not only continued, but became more and more keen, to his life's end.

Notwithstanding that Friedrich has asserted the Wiclifian origin of Hus' doctrines, yet he speaks subsequently[1] of the errors of Hus; and in particular calls the doctrine of absolute predestination a Hussite doctrine, although Hus adopted it word for word from the writings of Wiclif. One recognises therefrom that Friedrich, too, had formed no perfectly distinct view of the true relation of Hus and his adherents to the doctrines of Wiclif. Only in this way is it intelligible that Friedrich should exclaim with animation, "It is indeed true, and we do not deny it for a single moment, that the modern period dawned with John Hus, and not first with Luther."[2] This, however, is about the opposite of that which Friedrich himself has asserted concerning the originality of Hussitism.

Various errors are to be discovered in the mono-

[1] Division II., *Johann Hus als Reformator und seine Verurtheilung*, 5 *ff.*, "False doctrines of Hus." The doctrine of Predestination was expounded by Wiclif in several of his writings. See the sequel.

[2] While (Div. I. v.) Hus is with the exception of one or two articles a faithful disciple of Wiclif, it is there said (Div. II. 5) that Hus assailed the Church; *he* wished to found another church; *he* proclaimed doctrines and principles which ran counter to Christian truth; the system of Hus is spoken of, etc.

graphs of LÜDERS,[1] BECKER,[2] and BONNECHOSE.[3] That Hus derived manifold incentives and much furtherance from the writings of Wiclif, is accentuated by them all, while they are all characterised more or less by a lack of critical exactness.

Hus is by W. BERGER designated the most important representative of the Wiclifian tendency.[4] Berger certainly has not entered into the question, how much in Hus' writings is to be traced back to Wiclif, and how much goes to form the intellectual property of the Bohemian magister. Yet the fact is emphasised, that, once Hus had become acquainted with the philosophical works of Wiclif, he was from that time forward of his life held captive thereby. As opposed to the enthusiastic terms in which Krummel speaks of the intellectual significance of Hus, which he represents as exceedingly great, Berger rightly observes that the education of Hus did not rise beyond the ordinary standard of that age. In particular Berger has altogether declined to accept that which is told us of the thorough classic attainments of Hus. It may, no doubt, be admitted that Hus, as is assumed by Berger in following Schwab, bestowed special diligence upon the reading of the *Decretum* of Gratian; only this is to be discovered with great difficulty from the writings of Hus himself, seeing that—as already observed—the passages were derived only

[1] *Johannes Hus*, Cüstrin 1854.
[2] *Die beiden böhmischen Reformatoren, Johann Hus und Hieronymus von Prag*, Nördlingen 1858.
[3] *Johann Huss und das Concil zu Kostnitz* (German translation), 3rd editn., Leipzig 1870.
[4] *Johannes Hus u. König Sigmund*, Augsb. 1871, 37 sqq., spec. 165.

mediately, and that through the citations of Wiclif, from the *Decretum* of Gratian. What has been said of the classic culture of Hus, applies, as remarked by Berger, also to his acquaintance with Natural Science and with Medicine, as likewise to his knowledge of Hebrew.

With Berger, too, much appears as the property of Hus, which proceeds altogether from Wiclif. When, *inter alia*, it is said in Berger's work, that Hus' speech in opposition to the papal bull is the most excellent production among his genuine writings now extant, and in its nature a model of acute and telling argument; we are constrained to say, on the other hand, that this very argument was furnished, not by Hus but by Wiclif.[1]

A more correct view of the relation of John Hus to Wiclif has been expressed by SCHWAB in his monograph on John Gerson. Hardly can we concede to him, indeed, that Hus derived the bulk of his proof-passages, taken from the Fathers, out of the *Decretum*, and that he had a more full acquaintance only with the writings of Gregory, Augustine, and Bernard, as single expressions in his sermons would lead us to conjecture: on the contrary, it admits of demonstration, that Hus derived the great majority of those passages found in the *Decretum* from the writings of Wiclif, and that the citations from Gregory, Augustine, and Bernard were made, not direct from their works, but from Wiclif. In order to attain to perfect clearness in this respect, we must place beside Hus' tractate *De ecclesia* not

[1] See below.

only writings like the *Trialogus* and *De Christo et Adversario*, but also the very dissertation of Wiclif bearing the same name as that of Hus. Schwab, however, has rightly given prominence to the fact that Neander is inclined to assign to Hus a greater degree of significance than is due to him,[1] and in particular he has already declared certain passages from the tractate *De ecclesia* to be the intellectual property of Wiclif. Certainly many others also, which Schwab still reckons to be genuinely Hussite, or where he has indicated the influence of Wiclif as doubtful, will prove themselves, in the citations to be made farther on, the genuine property of Wiclif. Thus, *e.g.*, to take only one case, Wiclif's view of indulgences as a matter of fact influenced Hus—a circumstance which Schwab represents as doubtful; yea, Hus explained the very idea of the indulgence in the same words as Wiclif.

Yet more clear, and more in accordance with facts, is the judgment expressed by Schwab on Hus and Wiclif, in the Preface to his monograph.[2] So when he says that the great significance which is still attached to Hus in the work of Böhringer, is more than his due; that Hus himself in Constance laboured to invalidate the destructive consequences which had been drawn from his assertions—made in adhesion to the teaching of Wiclif—by virtue of explanations intended to bring about a harmony with the ecclesiastical standpoint. And it is justly said of Wiclif that he is of greater importance in

[1] Schwab, *Johannes Gerson, Professor der Theologie und Kanzler der Universität zu Paris*, 550 *ff.*

[2] *Ibid.*, xi.

relation to the Reformation of the sixteenth century than has hitherto been admitted on the part of Protestant Theology in general; for with Wiclif not only is the principle of Scripture fully developed, but also, implicitly at least, that of justification by Faith.

But yet, Schwab thinks, the standpoint of Hus remains in essential points different from that of Wiclif. It was, with the exception of the doctrine of the Church, almost exclusively the Reformational-ethical side of Wiclif's teaching, which he sought to appropriate. This view, upon a comparison of the writings on either side, can no longer be maintained.

Yet if in the course of Schwab's argument on Wiclif and Hus some few erroneous statements should appear,[1] this circumstance is easily explicable, considering the lack there is of a complete edition of Wiclif's works.

TSCHACKERT, too, in his eminent work on Peter d'Ailli, has spoken of different articles of Hus, which in reality belong to Wiclif. Thus when it is said:[2] At the Council they first scrutinised with all severity Hus' doctrine of Predestination in its application to the idea of the Church. The Church is the totality

[1] I find that Hus expresses himself not otherwise than Wiclif in regard to Faith also:

Wiclif, *De eccl.*, cap. ii.:	Hus:
"Sed constat ex dictis, quod fides nunc sumitur pro actu credendi, quo creditur, nunc pro habitu credendi . . ."	"Notandum, quod fides nunc sumitur pro actu credendi, quo creditur, nunc pro habitu credendi . . ."

Comp. the whole passage, *infrà*, bk. ii., chap. 3, p. 208.

[2] *Petrus von Ailli, zur Geschichte des grossen abendländischen Schismas und der Reformconcilien von Pisa und Constanz*, 225 *ff*, 231.

of the predestinated, and only as such can it form an article of faith. This one principle overthrew the whole structure of hierarchical Church, and therewith the claims of the Council. But only at the reading of the twelfth article, which derived the papal dignity from the emperors, did Ailli challenge the accused. The one article as well as the other belongs notably, from beginning to end, to Wiclif; who unfolded his doctrine of Predestination repeatedly, in the *Trialogus*, in the tractate *De ecclesia*, in that *De Christo et Adversario suo Antichristo*, etc., and from whom Hus derived it, together with its application to the idea of the Church. The propositions, that the Holy Catholic Church is only the totality of those who, according to God's eternal counsel, are true members of the mystical body of Christ; that Holy Scripture is alone the norm of the Christian faith; that the worthy priests stand on a level with each other, and have immediately from Christ the power to administer the sacraments, and others also, are ascribed to Hus, whereas they are in reality derived from his predecessor and master. Hus had thus distinguished in a genuinely Reformational sense, continues Tschackert, between the true Church of Christ and that actually present, but had at the same time regarded the sacramental power of the priest as conditioned by his religious and moral worthiness. In all these places we must substitute for the name of Hus that of Wiclif, or at least must indicate the source of Hus' doctrines. With perfect justice, however, does Tschackert give prominence to the fact that Peter d'Ailli and Hus agree on one point, that the rock on which the Church

is founded is Christ Himself.[1] Yet neither is this proposition the peculiar property of Hus, but is to be met with, in different variations of form, in several writings of Wiclif.

Much more highly, as far as we can see, has the influence of Wiclif upon Hus been rated by HÖFLER. But he has neglected to adduce the corresponding passages in evidence for the different assertions, and so it has come about that even after Höfler's work had appeared, this influence has been as energetically doubted, or altogether denied, as it has been asserted by him. "Certainly," says Höfler,[2] "Hus himself was partly to blame for the confusion of notions which prevailed with regard to him. He constantly defended Wiclif, commended his doctrine to the students, disputed publicly in proof of the orthodoxy of Wiclif; and yet, while thus continually identifying himself with Wiclif, demanded that he should not be looked upon as a Wiclifite." It is acknowledged that Höfler has in view external credentials for the Wiclify of Hus; but the testimonies in point proceed, we admit, for the greater part from his opponents. The proof-passages, strictly so called, that Hus—as HAUSRATH has somewhat roughly expressed it[3]—stole his whole theology from Wiclif, are wanting. On this account Höfler's writings, of however profound studies they may be the result, have failed to convince any one. At best, people have only come

[1] *Ibid.*, 17.

[2] *Geschichtschreiber der husitisch. Bewegung*, iii. 90; l. xvii. Comp. also his *Magister Johannes Hus und der Abzug der deutschen Professoren und Studenten aus Prag.*, 159*ff.*

[3] Hausrath, "Höflers Entdeckungen im Mladenowicz," in *Von Sybel's hist. Zeitschrift*, vi. 18.

to the impression that Hus merely "built up his doctrines upon the teaching of Wiclif," that he "followed Wiclif's leadership," and that "other leaders of the Bohemian nation likewise followed him in this domain."

It might be expected that Gotthard LECHLER, the distinguished judge of Wiclif's writings, as of those of Hus, would have finally solved the question. In reality Lechler has most nearly approximated to the true state of the matter.[1] The whole Hussite movement is for him, although he recognises other factors as coming into play, essentially only a consequence of that which was done in the way of ecclesiastical reform in England. The chapter on the Reformation in Bohemia is ranged under the head of the "after-effects of Wiclif's labours." With justice does Lechler argue that Hus' whole doctrine of the Church—idea of the Church, Church and Pope, etc.—proceeds from Wiclif; even though Hus neglects to mention his source by name. "It is a fact," says Lechler, "that the determining notions and views of Wiclif are expressed, so that only the carrying of them out on each particular occasion is the property of Hus."[2] But likewise the establishing and demonstration of the main points is not rarely conducted in accordance with the precedent set by

[1] Lechler, *Johann von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation*. 2 Vols. Leipzig, 1873.

[2] Lechler further also corrects some errors on the part of Neander. Thus Lechler says, "If Neander judges that with Hus, on account of his eminently practical tendency, less rugged and harsh expressions as regards the denial of all liberty, are to be met with than in Wiclif, this betrays error and an insufficient acquaintance with the last named."

Wiclif. Hus demonstrably owes to Wiclif's writings his acquaintance with Grossetête,[1] and the latter's opposition to Innocent IV. The conception of Church history during the first three centuries, of the soaring aloft of the papacy—as alleged, by virtue of the grant made by Constantine—was beyond dispute inherited by Hus from Wiclif. With perfect justice Lechler argues that during 1409, 1410, and the years following, Wiclifism is the point about which the whole movement in Bohemia turns, as is evidenced by the testimony of official documents.

Unfortunately Lechler attaches too great a degree of importance to the Bohemian movement, and a less degree to the comparison of the several writings of Wiclif and Hus. In this way it comes about that more of an independent character is still claimed by him for the Hussite movement than it actually possesses; and it has been possible, even after Lechler's profound and far-reaching studies, entirely to deny the true relation which subsists between Hus and Wiclif. It is significant that this should take place five years after the publication of Lechler's fundamental investigations, and despite an acquaintance therewith; as has been done in the case of a French work based specially on the studies of Czechist historians.

Among the modern Czechist investigators TOMEK[2]

[1] That the writings of Robertus Lincolniensis were known in Bohemia also may be shown from *Cod.* X. H. 12 of the Prague University Library, in which codex some single works of Grossetête are to be met with. Perhaps, however, his writings were in request only because this bishop is so often appealed to by Wiclif.

[2] In his book, *Dejepis mesta Prahy*, dil iii. 450.

recognises the great influence exerted upon Hus by the study of Wiclif's writings. He dwells on the deep-felt reverence and attachment with which the first-named clung to his beloved exemplar. But with all the esteem in which Wiclif, the renowned Christian teacher, or the "evangelic doctor," was held by Hus, the latter was, according to Tomek's explanation, by no means "a blind adherent of Wiclif's doctrine." While drawing from Wiclif's books that which seemed to him right and profitable, he laboured not less than Mathias of Janow or Thomas of Stitny to remain in union with the doctrine of the Church Universal.[1] Tomek argues that Hus never approved of that particular doctrine of Wiclif's of which traces were first found in Bohemia, namely, that of the sacrament of the altar, and in like manner the doctrine that for the valid discharge of priestly functions the subjective fitness of the priest is called for. Like his predecessor, Mathias of Janow, he attached the highest value to Holy Scripture, as the most certain and absolutely infallible source for the Christian faith; but he did not, like Wiclif, reject the tradition of the Church and the teachings of the holy doctors. Even with Mathias of Janow he did not agree in all points of doctrine; he demeaned himself in many things more calmly than the latter. As will be seen, there is here attributed to the Hussite doctrine a certain comparative independence, alike of the precursors, as also of Wiclif. But on the doctrine of the Supper Hus has, at least for a time, expressed himself in a strongly Wiclifian sense, as we must absolutely

[1] See, on the other hand, the arguments in Lenz.

infer from the depositions made against him; and in his position towards the Scriptures as the norm of faith he is dependent, as will be shown below, not upon his predecessors, but upon Wiclif. To tradition and the fathers, however, he did not at all times ascribe an equal degree of significance. Tomek, nevertheless, concedes to Wiclify a great influence upon the course of development of the Hussite doctrine.

At similar conclusions does LENZ arrive, in his book likewise written in the Czech language: "The doctrine of the magister, John Hus, on the basis of his Latin and Czechian writings, together with his condemnation by the Council at Constance."[1] In the introduction he expresses himself only incidentally on the relation of Hus to Wiclif. "In this excentric being," says Lenz, speaking of the labours of Hus as a preacher,[2] "Hus had before him as a model of perfectly demoniacal vehemence, the master Johannes Wiclif. Hus clasped to his heart the writings of the English reformer, just on account of their Reformational tendency, without once suspecting the gulf which opened between Wiclif and the catholic doctrine of the faith. Nay, it would seem as though Hus never, to the time of his death, attained to this knowledge. The London Synod had, it is true, condemned four-and-twenty articles of Wiclif's, and that as early as 1382, and this was

[1] *Useni mistra Jana Husi*, etc., V. Praze, 1875. For German readers there exists an abstract of the first part of this book in the *Progr. des k. k. deutschen Staatsgymnasiums in Budweis*, 1881, prepared by Dr. Kubista.

[2] *Ibid.*, iii.

certainly no secret to Hus. But the latter was not at all shaken thereby in his favourable judgment of John Wiclif; so far from this, he early manifested himself to be Wiclif's friend.

"But, although Hus found his pattern in the doctrine of Wiclif, it would be erroneous to assert that Hus was a blind imitator of Wiclif; for the two men are very markedly different. Hus followed Wiclif only to a certain extent."[1] In accordance with such judgment Hus' doctrine is still held to be more or less original, and undoubtedly Wiclifian doctrines and arguments are looked upon as those of Hus.

Lenz would have come to a different judgment if he had formed as intimate an acquaintance with the writings of the English Reformer as he has with the writings of Hus. But the investigation of Hus' writings as respects their source is a subject upon which he did not at all enter. At all events he has received the impression from the study of Hus' writings themselves and of the official documents relating to them, that Wiclif's writings must have exerted an important influence upon Hus. It is thus the more remarkable that this fact could be once more called in question, and even with a certain degree of warmth.

The last writer who has discussed the relation of Hus to Wiclif is ERNEST DÉNIS.[2] That he has done so without acquainting himself with the writings of the two men is at once apparent; since he could not otherwise have denied in such strong

[1] *Ibid.*, x.
[2] *Huss et la Guerre des Hussites;* Paris, 1878.

terms the influence which has been exerted by Wiclif's writings upon Hus and the whole Bohemian movement. "Almost all the Chroniclers of the fifteenth century," says Dénis, "represent Hussitism as something smuggled in from England: so Nieder, Corner, Andrew of Ratisbon, in their chronicles; Meisterlein in his chronicles of Nuremberg, etc." "Not to speak of Höfler, who is no authority," it is further said, "in our own days Lechler, in his beautiful work, has suffered himself to be led away a little,[1] perhaps by admiration for his hero, with whom he is eminently acquainted. All the efforts of the Prague clergy and of the enemies of the Reformation were directed to the one object of bringing the cause into union with that of Wiclif. As a disciple of Wiclif Hus was excommunicated by the Archbishop of Prague, and condemned by the Council at Constance. His opponents drew a twofold advantage from this event. In representing the innovators as common plagiaries from a British philosopher, they weakened their influence with the Bohemians and rendered their condemnation almost inevitable, seeing that the doctrines of Wiclif had repeatedly been pronounced heretical by the English councils. The conflict was waged with much dexterity, and

[1] "M. Böhringer," it is added, "s'est prononcé dans le même sens, mais avec moins d' exagération et sans contester l'importance de l'œuvre des prédicateurs qui avaient précédé Huss. M. Palacky avait accepté d'abord l'idée de l'influence anglaise, mais il l'a abandonnée complètement à la suite de critiques qui lui ont été presentées par un des plus savants historiens de l'église, Néander. Krummel a suivi Néander. Les faits ont été désormais établis d'une manière incontestable par M. Tomek." How little this is the case will be shown by the presentation in the sequel.

even in our own day many historians, alike whether friendly or hostile towards Hus, see in the Bohemian reformation only a counterpart of the attempt made by the English philosopher. The points on which Hus was in harmony with Wiclif had already been treated by Mathias of Janow. Wiclif was rather the pretext than the ground of that conflict, which must sooner or later break out between those who would root up the abuses and restore the Church to its original purity, and those who for the defence of their privileges wielded the masses."

The design of the following pages is to return a final answer on this subject of investigation.

BOOK I.

WICLIFISM IN BOHEMIA DOWN TO THE TIME OF ITS CONDEMNATION BY THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE.

CHAPTER I.

CONDITION OF ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS IN BOHEMIA IN THE TIME OF CHARLES IV.—ARNEST OF PARDUBITZ AND THE BOHEMIAN CHURCH.

TO any one in the Bohemia, Moravia, or Silesia, of the last decade of the fourteenth century, who might recal the times he has known under CHARLES IV.; or even for the man who should take a retrospective glance during the first twenty or thirty years of the following century, the days of Charles IV. must appear to be the golden age. In reality, the authors express themselves with sufficient animation in regard to these times. "This glorious prince," exclaims LUDOLPH OF SAGAN, "a friend of righteousness and an ardent lover of peace, was so energetic in the establishment of order in Bohemia, that no armed hand was raised against a neighbour. In forest and champaign there prevailed the deepest peace, and one need not fear to travel the highways though he were laden with gold."[1]

Not so enthusiastically indeed, yet with sufficient warmth, are these times described by other writers, specially such as belong to the spiritual estate. The

[1] Ludolf von Sagan, "De longevo schismate" (ed. Loserth), in the *Archiv für öst. Gesch.*, lx., 408.

clergy felt the change therefrom much more severely; the reign of Wenzel pressed heavily upon them, and afforded but few gleams of light.

How different was the state of matters under Charles IV., the friend of the clergy, the priests' kaiser, *imperadore de preti*, as he has been called by an historian of distant Italy,[1]—under that king whose greatest boast it seemed to be to erect new churches, and to restore those which had fallen into decay.

Even in the empire they extolled his affection for the Church. "Charles," we hear a Nuremberger say, "was an exceeding diligent man for the sacred cause, and he sought and pursued after the same, and honoured it in every land.[2]

The clergy had in other respects great joy in this emperor. He was, from training as by inclination, still more a clergyman than a layman.[3] Like a priest he submitted to the ecclesiastical exercises, was able to give a splendid exposition of the Psalter or Gospels,[4] and to hold disputations with masters and doctors. The love for disputation he transmitted to his son Wenzel, who was fond of discussing controverted points in theology, specially if they were of a subtle nature. Of the theological lore of

[1] Giovanni Villani, xii., 60.

[2] Sigmund Meisterlin, *Chroniken der deutschen Städte*, 3 Bd. (Nürnberg), 156.

[3] See the Funeral Address of Archbishop Ocko v. Wlaschim, in Freher, *Script. rer. Bohemic.* III.: "Nam horas suas canonicas, sicut unus sacerdos dicebat . . . psalterium in aliquibus locis pulcherrime exposuit . . . ipse enim fuit ordinatus acoluthus."

[4] See below, Book II., chap. iv. Hus took the passage from Wiclif's treatise, *De Ecclesia* (Cod. Pal. Vind., 3929, fol. 66a).

Charles IV. much has been preserved; expositions of parables, etc.

That under such a sway the Church should thrive, even in outward respects, was to be expected: its increase in material possessions, in investments and foundations, is in reality something astonishing. The statement of Hus, that a fourth, or even a third, of the land and soil in Bohemia was in mortmain, is not, to be sure, strictly vouched for,—he drew it from Wiclif, and transferred to Bohemian affairs that which applied to the state of things in England; but the condition of things even in Bohemia was certainly somewhat analogous. It is clear that this could not lead to the prosperity of the Church. It is true that under Charles IV. those men who were placed at the head of the ecclesiastical organization as yet took care that the clergy did not fall utterly a prey to worldliness, and to those ills with which the clergy in other lands were infected.

Among the men of whom Charles IV. availed himself for the execution of his plans, no one enjoyed greater confidence with the monarch than ARNEST OF PARDUBITZ,[1] who stood at the head of the Bohemian Church from the year 1343, when he succeeded the much-tried John of Drazic.

His ecclesiastical administration constituted a new epoch, and was for many years after his death regarded as a model one.

He was descended from the Bohemian family of the Knights of Weissenburg, and pursued his first studies

[1] For the biographical notices on Arnest von Pardubitz, see Tadra in the Cancellaria Arnesti, *Archiv für öst. Gesch.*, lxi., 276, ff.

among the Johannites in Glatz; then with the Benedictines in Braunau, whence he repaired to Prague,—probably to the Metropolitan School,—whence finally, for the sake of perfecting his education, he went to attend the Universities of Bologna and Padua. After his return to his native land, he was made Dean of the Collegiate Chapter in Sadska, and presently drew upon himself the attention of Charles IV. It is said to be owing to the influence of this monarch that he obtained the see of Prague. The circumstances of the time were then exceedingly favourable to the accomplishment of a long-cherished wish of the Bohemian kings, for the realization of which Premysl Ottokar I. had ardently longed so early as the year 1204,—the severance, namely, of Prague from its connection with the archiepiscopal see of Mayence, and its elevation to an archbishopric. The Archbishop of Mayence, Heinrich von Virneburg, one of the most faithful adherents of Lewis of Bavaria, had been suspended by the Pope on the 15th October, 1341. From this time the chiefs of the House of Luxemburg renewed their attempt to found an archbishopric in Prague; and nothing contributed more to forward their ends than the elevation of Clement VI. to the papal throne—a man who as a simple cleric had been on a friendly footing with Charles IV. In November 1343, this Pope invited King John of Bohemia, and his son the Margrave Charles, to Avignon, in order personally to set forth their reasons in favour of the erection of an archbishopric in Prague. The bull by which Prague was constituted an archiepiscopal see bears date of 30th April, 1344. As grounds for the severance of the connection, centuries old, with Mayence, the

same, strictly speaking, were alleged as had been urged in 1204—the great distance from Mayence, and the difference of language in Germany and Bohemia. The first archbishop was Arnest.[1] From this period it is that we derive the sketch of him drawn by Dean William, of Lestkow: "A man of imposing figure and pleasing expression, an earnest taciturn nature, yet full of benevolence and kindness." His liberality, specially towards poor students, is particularly lauded, and it is expressly remarked that he was a foe to all nepotic leanings. He was the confessor and familiar friend of the emperor, and likewise distinguished himself in diplomatic actions. In the year 1346 he went to Avignon with Duke Niklas, of Troppau, to announce to the Pope the election of Charles IV. Villani, too, makes mention of Arnest's skill in diplomacy. When the university was founded, Arnest obtained the dignity of a chancellor of the same. It is even said that, upon the death of Innocent VI., there were thoughts of raising him to the papal throne. His modesty, we are told, prevented his accepting the purple. To his last hours we find him engaged in the service of the emperor. In the train of the latter he was staying at Bautzen, in the Whitsuntide of 1364, and there after a brief illness he expired on the 30th of June.

His services rendered to art and literature may be

[1] Erben, *Regesta Bohemiæ*, 482: "Supplicarunt . . . rex et populus Bohemorum, ut cum archiepiscopus vester propter locorum distanciam et diversitatem linguarum minus sufficiat circa eos metropoliticum officium exercere." Doc. d. dato Lateran., 1204, April 21st.

passed over in this place. In the ecclesiastical domain he developed a marvellous talent for organization. His successors needed to do no more than complete the building on the foundation laid by him. Abundant monuments of his labour are to be found in a book of formularies proceeding from his chancery,[1] as moreover especially in his statutes and synodal constitutions. Since the former provincial statutes had lost their significance, after the separation of the diocese of Prague from Mayence, Arnest was compelled to lay down new rules. This was done at the great Provincial Synod of the year 1349; at this the statutes of Arnesti were announced, which should in future serve as the code for the metropolitan diocese, and so also for Olmütz and Leitomischl.[2] The abuses existing in these dioceses, particularly those having respect to the acquiring of benefices, and the obtaining of ordination, were to be brought to an end; the moral bearing of the clergy raised, the condition of the people improved, and the ecclesiastical government in general rigorously enforced.[3] The suffragan bishops of Olmütz and Leitomischl had to announce the statutes in their dioceses. In all the churches of the land, copies of them must be kept, namely, two in each of the cathedral and collegiate churches, and one with each of the archdeacons, and in the deaneries and parishes.

Three months after their publication no clergyman

[1] *Cancellaria Arnesti.* Formulary of the age of Arnest von Pardubitz, first Archbishop of Prague, edited by Tadra, in the *Archiv für öst. Gesch.*, lxi. 469, ff.

[2] On the MSS. and impressions of these statutes see Dudik, 37 vol. of *Archiv für öst. Gesch.*, 414.

[3] Frind, *Kirchengeschichte von Böhmen*, ii. 94.

was to be permitted to plead want of acquaintance with their contents.

Every archbishop, upon his accession to office, was required to pledge himself on oath to a strict observance of the statutes.

For the establishment of the new order, the support of the cathedral chapter was energetically demanded. To the conditions of the latter, Arnest, as it would seem, soon after his elevation to the archbishopric, devoted his particular attention. A special commission was appointed, among other things, to draw up statutes for the cathedral chapter.[1] The members thereof, however, were not able to agree on a number of important points, on which the prosperity of the Church seemed to depend; moreover, single parts of the same were too sharply conceived, in such wise that some determinations had to be modified; others were so obscure as to call for a commentary. In short, the need was felt for proceeding to a remodelling of the whole.

This difficult task was assigned to the Doctor of Theology and Prebendary of Prague, John of Padua.[2] Arnest took upon himself a considerable share of the labour, inasmuch as he subjected the statutes to a repeated examination. They were written out upon nine sheets of parchment in the year 1350, by the hand of the notary Albert of Wayzow. These

[1] See the introduction to the Statuta ecclesie Pragensis, edited by Dudik, in the 37th vol. of the *Archiv für öst. Gesch.*, 422: "Quamvis dudum de nostra et capituli ecclesie nostre voluntate et consensu quedam statuta per certos statuarios ad hoc . . . per nos electos . . . pro ecclesia nostra et personis ipsius fuissent edita. . . ."

[2] On this person see *Cancell. Arnesti*, 296.

statutes embrace the whole sphere of labour of all the persons belonging to the chapter, and to the metropolitan church. The rights and duties of each one were accurately defined, and the incomes of all enumerated. That in the imposition of new statutes respect was had to ancient customs existing within the diocese of Prague, will be taken for granted.[1]

A series of further regulations, too, which Arnest called into existence, was retained in after times. Synods had already been held in Bohemia and Moravia before the days of Arnest of Pardubitz; now it was made a rule that they should assemble twice a year on fixed days. For the stricter maintenance of the enactments he had issued he created the institution of correctors, who were to watch over the conduct of the clergy, and to administer exhortations, threats, and chastisements. Side by side with these correctors appear inquisitors, who were to see to the preservation of the faith in its purity.[2]

Under such circumstances the assertion made by a biographer of Arnest is quite credible, that there was not found in all Germany a second bishop whose activity even distantly approached that of the Prague bishop.[3] We are able to admire this, even in the present day, in his Books of Foundations and Ratifications.[4]

[1] Moreover, it is naturally to be supposed that particular parts of the statutes would agree with those which the Archbishops of Mayence had formerly enacted. Similar, too, were the statutes of Arnest for the diocese of Olmütz. They are published by Dudik in vol. 41 of the *Archiv* before mentioned, p. 195, ff.

[2] Vita Arnesti, *Geschichtschr. der husit. Bewegung*, ii. 6.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[4] The former are the *Libri erectionum*, containing the

The successor of Arnest of Pardubitz, JOHN OCKO OF WLASCHIM, previously Bishop of Olmütz, like Arnest himself, a friend and counsellor of the emperor, advanced farther on the lines of his predecessor. It is specially noteworthy that most of the Synodal statutes that have come down to us belong to the time of this archbishop. We may best learn from these the moral condition of the clergy and people in the Caroline period, on which account it is worth while to dwell for a moment on this subject. The earliest Synodal Statutes now preserved date from the year 1353; thus come down to us from Arnest of Pardubitz.

The first and principal concern of the archbishop is devoted to the heretics.[1] The clergy are called upon to make zealous search after heretics and other suspicious persons, and to inform of them either to the archbishop himself or to the inquisitor. The second object of concern is found in the Provincial Synods. At these all the clergy of the diocese were required to be present, and to bring with them the Synodal Statutes. Only to the poor was the providing of these remitted. For the administration of the sacraments and the burial of the dead no fee was to be charged, for the ringing of bells only a moderate charge was to be made. The sacred vessels are to be kept clean; the congregations to be invited to repair to the religious actions; with

institution of masses, benefices, etc. The other, *Libri confirmationum*, contain all presentations and appointments to ecclesiastical benefices. See Frind, *Kirchengesch.*, ii. 96.

[1] Of the proceedings of Arnest against ordeals there is found, remarkably enough, little or nothing in the Synodal statutes. See on this point the *Vita Arnesti*, as before, p. 7.

silence and reverence they must be attended. The vices of gluttony and drunkenness, gaming, debauches, soothsaying, etc., were to be opposed by the clergy with all their might.

It is emphatically required that the clergy lead a moral life, abstain from dancing-rooms and other scenes of pleasure, most strictly observe the prescribed prayers and ceremonies, admit no strangers to the pastoral office, and denounce to the archbishop those who are usurers, enemies of the clergy, and despisers of the Church censures. They are to refrain from unchastity; clergy who live with young women, or who bear arms, card-players and dice-players, incendiaries, thieves and harbourers of thieves, are to be prosecuted by the archdeacons. Further regulations are directed against the murderers of persons in orders. Sundays and festivals are to be celebrated with becoming devotion, and the fasts enjoined are to be observed. Stolen property must be restored, the faithful must guard against setting forests on fire; incendiaries of the forests, such as are called Pozary, can be absolved only by the archbishop himself. Of these statutes every priest is required to possess a copy.

A statute of the year 1355 contains several new directions.[1] We see what stress was already laid upon the employment and culture of the language of the people. The parish priests and their vicars are required to make use of the national language in

[1] The expression, *Statutum minus*, may easily mislead. One might from this take these statutes for an abstract of the greater statutes; in reality we have here a series of fresh determinations.

their sermons on Sundays and holy days, as also in the reading of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer

The directions with regard to certain feast-days are new (for instance, the feast of relics), as are those regarding indulgences and some liturgical matters. These statutes, too, are to be carefully preserved. Another statute of 18th of October, 1361, alters certain instructions of the great statutes. Some points in this are quite new; the most important are the decisions laid down against clergy of the lower degrees, who wish sometimes to pass for clergymen, sometimes for laymen, in order in a particular case to escape from the spiritual or secular jurisdiction.

To the same province the statutes of John Ocko of Wlaschim, and his successor, John of Jenzenstein, are restricted. It is, as a rule, the vices above mentioned, against which the later synods, too, feel called upon to inveigh,—the tendency of the clergy to a worldly life, to gaming and drinking, and sexual excesses. In others of the faithful other faults are censured besides, and measures are taken against depredations, stealing, and receiving of stolen goods. With special frequency do prohibitions of usury occur. It is strictly enjoined that every archdeacon, dean, priest, and vicar, be familiar with the contents of the Provincial and Synodal Statutes. Remains of heathendom in the customs of the people are combated; so also the expulsion of death, which is still known in the Slavonic districts on the Oder and Vistula.[1] Equally are certain songs and games pro-

[1] "De mortis imagine: Item quia in nonnullis civitatibus, oppidis, et villis prava clericorum inolevit abusio, quia in medio quadragesime imagines in figura mortis per civitatem

hibited. The only question is, what was the effect of the numerous commandments which were inculcated anew almost every year? It has no very promising sound when we find in the Synodal Statutes complaints against the archdeacons, to whom the inspection of the single deaneries was entrusted, and hear that for the sake of base gain they pass over in silence notorious sins of the clergy.[1] With regard to the state of ecclesiastical affairs, *before* and *during* the Hussite disturbances, we are happily well informed. For the time of Arnest of Pardubitz, many interesting details will be found in his *Cancellaria*; for the time of the Archbishop Ocko of Wlaschim, and John of Jenzenstein, we owe much to a book dating from 1379,[2] wherein are recorded the incidents of an archdeacon's tour of visitation through several deaneries. From another book, belonging to the year 1407, in which the mode of proceeding against peccant clergy is narrated, we obtain the corresponding supplementations.

We derive from these sources the conviction that the numerous and severe regulations issued at the Synods were called forth indeed by an urgent necessity, but that, taken as a whole, they produced no great result. It is true we are told in the biography

cum rithmis et ludis supersticiosis ad flumen deferunt, ibi quoque ipsas imagines cum impetu submergunt, in earum ignominiam asserentes quod mors eis ultra nocere non debeat, tamquam ab ipsorum terminis sit consumata et totaliter exterminata."—*Conc. Prag.*, 11.

[1] *Concilia Prag.*, 12: "Archidiaconi in suis visitacionibus . . . que sunt questus et turpia lucra querunt." On the duties of the archdeacons, see Tadra, *Cancellaria Arnesti*, as before, p. 284.

[2] See below, Appendix, No. II.

of Arnest, that this archbishop put an entire stop to the deep degeneracy in Church discipline throughout the diocese of Prague; in reality it is certain that grave offences against ecclesiastical discipline were far from uncommon.[1] We find in its documents that many priests, without permission of their superiors, live remote from their places of labour, without troubling themselves very much about the exhortations of the deans, yea, farm out their livings to other persons;[2] and that the monasteries and nunneries have need of repeated admonitions to lead an orderly life. Complaints of the concubinage of the clergy occur just as before; archdeacons who ought to report these things are bribed, others have to be repeatedly admonished to undertake at all the inspections committed to them. The magistrates of the Kleine Stadt of Prague receive full authorisation to arrest and imprison particular priests, who pass their time in taverns with ninepins and dice, or who range through the streets in arms;[3] the capitulars of the Prague church suffer the school to fall into decay.[4] Some of the clergy get deeply into debt, etc.

[1] "Nimirum clerus illius temporis modice proh dolor legi subiacebat . . . alius enim concubinis adhærens et nec tonsuram seu coronam deferens turpi se ipsum polluit foeditate, quorum tamen insania sub ipsius regimine conquievit penitus." *Geschichtschr. der husit. Beweg.*, ii. 7. See with regard to it, Tadra, *Cancellaria Arnesti*, as above, p. 286.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 291.

[3] *Ibid.*, 488: "Quod illos clericos, qui nulla necessitate coacti in thabernis inventi forent ludentes ad aleas, taxillos, vel globos . . . . vel de quorum fuga alias est suspicio, seu qui infames sunt . . . . item qui nocturno tempore sine lumine manu armata incedunt."

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 305.

Mention is made likewise of the heretics; particularly about the district of Pisek many are said to be found. It is still to be seen in the Consistorial Acts of 1381, that the ordination of priest Johl of Pisek could not be undertaken, because his father and grandfather were heretics.[1]

Matters seem to have become worse under Arnest's successor, John Ocko of Wlaschim.

The complaints which are brought before the visitors have reference most of all to the concubinage of the clergy.[2] There is hardly a church in which the visitor finds the life of the clergy altogether blameless. Consequently, as a rule, the first question of this visitator is, Whether there are to be found in the particular church those living in concubinage, whether among the clergy or the laity?—for the laity also had to be examined; knights, burghers, and peasants. If any are found guilty of these offences, then the investigation follows, which often brings strange things to light. The guilty are mulcted in sums of money to be devoted to the building of the cathedral, or are visited with excommunication. Very often there arise complaints of usury, practised by the clergy or by laymen. Yet crimes such as rape and robbery likewise present themselves. Most carefully is it provided that the statutes of Archbishop Arnest and the Synodal decrees be found in the parishes: it appears that a priest was required to exchange his damaged paper copy for one of parchment. Isolated complaints are made of disputed possession; oftener one hears of the frequenting of

[1] *Geschichtschr. der husit. Beweg.*, p. 340.
[2] See Appendix, No. II.

ale-houses and of the gaming of the clergy.[1] Of complaints about heretical views there is found nothing, as it would seem, in these records. To be just, we must confess that those excesses which created the greatest scandal were most severely punished. For theft and highway robbery, a priest, Wenzel of Kommotau, underwent an instant humiliating punishment, followed by a rigid confinement in prison for two years.[2] Another priest, known by the name of John, is punished on account of an act of highway robbery, committed by him along with two others in a forest on the way to St. Prokop. Another time it is a case of purloining books.[3] A harbourer of

[1] Acta Correctoria, *Liber archivi capit. Prag.*, XX., 38*b*: "Die mensis Martii dominus Hersso corrector cleri diocesis Pragensis mandavit domino Petro plebano, ut deinceps ludos . . . . non exerceat nec honestis mulieribus adhereat nec foveat . . . . die 26 Martii: mandavit domino Valentino plebano, ut deinceps Anne de Velvar quam tenuit pro domestica non adhereat nec ipsam visitet . . . . et loca inhonesta non visitet, suspectis non adhereat . . . . mandavit domino Petro plebano penitencia carcerali emisso, ut deinceps tabernas continuo non visitet.

[2] In the same records there is an entry of the punishment of this priest: "Pronunciamus . . . . dominum Wenceslaum presbyterum de Commutow furem et latronem, propter que et alia ipsum condempnamus ad standum in scala publice uno die per horas duas et in carcere clauso per annos duos continuos, ubi quartis et sextis feriis pane doloris et aqua angustie sit contentus."

[3] "Die nona mensis Octobris dominus Bohunco plebanus in Swagerzicz restituit librum viaticum . . . . in quo viatico in secundo folio . . . . ipsius viatici erat scriptum psalmus . . . . qui liber erat furtive ablatus per dominum Mathiam . . . . presbyterum domino Petro plebano in Mukarzew prope Pragam . . . . Quem librum ipse dominus Petrus recepit in presentia domini Herssonis correctoris. . . . Qui liber erat venditus ipsi domino Bohunconi in octoginta quinque grossis per prefatum dominum Mathiam."

thieves, at the expiration of his sentence, is dismissed with the admonition not in future to consort with thieves.[1]

It is, at any rate, remarkable that, among the particular cases which were investigated in the course of a single year, there are about twenty which have reference to theft.

We must not, however, confine our attention to the lower clergy alone; with the higher the state of matters was much worse. Certainly the provost of the cathedral chapter at Prague, George Burkhard of Janowitz, was no ornament to that body. We hear regarding him the following complaint of the Archbishop Zbinko of Hasenburg: "When I summoned the Provost of Prague to appear before me, on account of his lawlessness, the people assembled in crowds, to whom a few of the servants of the King joined themselves, equipped with cross-bows and habergeons, in order insolently with armed hand to resist this."

The testament of this gentleman has been discovered in the Record Office of the town of Budweiss. We learn from the same that he was the happy father of three sons, to whom, as it would seem, he bequeathed an amount of property not altogether inconsiderable.[2]

The existing disorders, which stand out in such glaring colours from the books of visitation and correction of the Archbishopric of Prague—to which

[1] "Furibus non adhereat."

[2] Köpl, Testament des Georg Burghard von Janowitz, in the *Mitth. des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen*, 21, 93.

must also be added the numerous complaints of the worldliness and corruption of the clergy in its highest strata—show clearly how the soil was already prepared for the vigorous reformational labours of individuals; only it must be borne in mind that not Bohemia alone was the soil on which this noxious growth was springing up. The divers projects of reform which were brought forward within the hierarchy itself, both before and during the session of the Council of Constance, contain the most abundant materials in evidence of this. To mention only a countryman of Hus, who in matters of ecclesiastical *doctrine* is certainly not to be numbered among his friends, STEPHEN OF PRAGUE; this man exclaims in his address to the fathers of the council: "But in the present day nothing is sought throughout the whole world save presents and profits, gain and honours, marks of favour and carnal lusts. Ignoramuses, incapables, and worthless men are promoted to the highest spiritual offices."[1] And another voice declares at the same council, "It is certainly necessary to root up from the earth the heretics in Bohemia and Moravia, but I cannot see how that is to be accomplished without a previous thorough reform of the Roman curia itself."[2]

[1] Von der Hardt, i. 843.

[2] *Ibid.*, vii. 306. Dietrich of Niem, *De nec. reform. in concil. univ.*, cap. 29: "Expediret ut hereses iste et autores earum de Bohemia et Moravia prefatis eradicentur omni modo. Sed non video quod illud unquam bono modo fieri posset, nisi predicta Romana curia prius ad ipsos veteres mores et consuetudines laudabiles reducatur." Compare, in addition to the above data, the energetic complaints of Hus concerning the bishops and priests of his time, the prebendaries and idle mass-reciters who hurry out of church into the inns and dancing

Upon a soil such as is furnished by the capital Prague, and the various deaneries of Bohemia, from whose villages, year after year, lively complaints reached the central points of the ecclesiastical life, an opposition to the existing scandals in the administration of the Church and in the lives of the clergy must find a vigorous response.

rooms. See *Sermons of John Hus, translated from the Bohemian*, by Novotny, i. 7—9, 27, 45; ii. 29, 45. In one place he speaks, indeed, of bishops, and even popes, who were unable to read. *Ibid.*, ii. 90.

CHAPTER II.

THE SO-CALLED PRECURSORS OF THE HUSSITE MOVEMENT.

THE first of those men who, full of Reformation zeal, declaimed warmly against existing abuses in the Church, and as a preacher attained to great success, was Konrad, a monk of the Augustine cloister of Waldhausen in Austria. Of the circumstances of his life but little is known. We owe some few notices to a defence which he wrote in reply to various attacks on the part of the mendicant friars.[1] Ordained priest about the year 1345, he went to Rome in 1350, with a view to becoming partaker of the grace of the jubilee year. He soon came to the front as a preacher of note: a wondrous power of language, which never failed of its effect, must have been at his command. "He roused the people to the pitch of excitement when he preached in Austria," was said of him by his opponents with malignant ambiguity. And when he held his services at the

[1] Further particulars regarding Konrad we owe to Palacky, who first (under the name of Jordan) treated more fully of the precursors of Hus. Palacky, *Vorläufer des Husitismus*, i. 17. Comp. also Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, iii. 1—17; Neander, *Kirchengeschichte*, vi. 240ff; Friedjung, *Karl*, iv., p. 168; and Tomek, *Dejepis Prahy*, 286 ff.

church of St. Gall in Prague, the spacious church was not able to contain all the audience, so that he was compelled to preach in the open market-place. Charles IV. had secured him for Prague through the medium of the lord von Rosenberg, and had assigned to him the post of preacher at the church aforesaid, which he presently exchanged for the cure of the Augustines in Leitmeritz. The field of labour was nevertheless too narrow for him there: with the permission of his order, and of the Archbishop, he came to Prague, and began to preach afresh. His return falls in the spring of 1358;[1] in the following year he resigned his charge at Leitmeritz, and shortly after obtained the parish of the Teyn Church in Prague. During a decade he there displayed a vigorous and abundant activity; while regarded askance by the mendicant friars, and passionately assailed by them, since their own churches had become empty. He died on the 8th December of the year 1369, deeply bewailed not only by the German, but also by the Czechist inhabitants of the city.[2]

Of the sermons of this man, those unfortunately are lost, on account of which he has been counted among the precursors of Hus.[3] What has been pre-

[1] As regards this date, see Tomek, *as above*, p. 286.

[2] Benesch von Weitmühl, ad ann. 1369: Hic cum esset natione de Austria, vir magnæ literaturæ, . . . prædicacione sancta sua correxit mores hominum patriæ nostræ.

[3] Considering the great zeal with which the Latin discourses of Konrad, and afterwards those of Milicius, were collected, it must appear strange that just the German sermons of Konrad (as also the Bohemian ones of Milicz) have disappeared. In some way the important pulpit addresses of other and less celebrated preachers have been preserved.

served to us of them has been taken down, not with a view to the instruction of the people, but with entirely different motives.

Those sermons known to us in the present day as proceeding from his pen were delivered before students, and, moreover, were mainly composed for academic purposes. Young priests were to receive from them impetus and material for their own discourses, and this end was served by them for many centuries after the death of their author. For they were not only very eagerly collected by the priests in Prague,[1] but were likewise disseminated throughout Moravia and Silesia, Austria and the Tyrol, even to Switzerland.[2] Inasmuch as Konrad of Waldhausen had made the collection of his sermons at the wish of those studying at Prague, it is designated in the MSS. as the Postil of the Prague students. In the majority of the copies one counts altogether seventy-three discourses. The first of these enlarges on the object of the collection. What he has preached to the people "with his own mouth," and what he has brought before the students "with fleeting voice," he will now commit to enduring writing.[3] From these

[1] Cod. 285 of the Bohem. Mus., 244: "Ferias Pentecostales de Postilla Conradi quere circa Quadragesimales dictorum suorum, *si illa poteris habere*. Ego autem non vidi eadem sed tantum Milicii."

[2] On MSS. in Bohemia see Palacky, *Vorläufer*, 16; in Moravia, Dudik in the *Archiv für öst. Gesch.*, vol. 39. On Tyrolese MSS., comp. Friedjung, *Karl* IV., p. 171. In Breslau, single MSS. are found as well in the town library as in the university library. On St. Gall see the catalogue of MSS. in the convent library, Nos. 714 and 805. Some are likewise found in single monasteries of Austria.

[3] "Ut supra evangelia dominicalia, que leguntur per anni circulum per talem modum, quo ipsam ad populum proprio

words we might readily conclude that these discourses had been addressed to the general public before he cast them into the mould of the Latin language. Opposed, however, to this view, is the whole learned apparatus with which Konrad has furnished them. Thus there are to be found, *e.g.*, in the sermon on the festival of Christ's ascension, in addition to more than a hundred quotations from the Bible, numerous passages (and some of these very obscure ones) from the sermons of Pope Leo, from the various works of St. Augustine, from the writings of Pope Gregory, from Jerome, Hraban, Bede, Valerius Maximus, the legend of St. Cunegonda, etc. In other sermons he cites likewise Aristotle, Cassiodorus, Basil, Vegetius, and others. That some of these quotations, moreover, are rather obscure and difficult to understand, he says himself in his introductory words.[1] What does it concern the general public, when, speaking of discipline, he narrates in detail the history of the siege of Numantia, mentions the different generals who were compelled to withdraw covered with disgrace, until at length Publius Cornelius Scipio succeeded in training his army to the exercise of discipline? or when, in another sermon, he expounds in a very learned way the

declamavi gutture, conscribere vellem et que voce transeunte et ipsis coram positis predicando deprompseram, scripture manciparem remanenti, creberrimis ac instantivis precibus rogitatus."

[1] "Desidero attamen et hoc ipsum opusculum postillam studiencium nominari, tum quia ipsorum precibus est compilatum, tum quia desidibus et ad studendum pigris minus valere dinoscitur propter eius longitudinem et eciam quibusdam *propter auctoritates doctorum obscuras in ipsa recollectas*."

whole controversy between the Greek and the Romish Church on the subject of the Holy Ghost?

Even the introduction to his sermons is of like construction. He explains therein the plan according to which he intends treating the whole material. As the solar year is divided into four greater periods, so, according to his view, the time from Adam to the end of the world resolves itself into four greater sections. The time from Adam to Moses is the time of darkness; then follows the time of twilight, which extends from Moses to Christ; the time of Christ is that of the atonement; and, finally, the time of pilgrimage is that from the ascension of Christ to the end of earthly things. According to this system the Church year is likewise naturally arranged into four parts. This arrangement, however, presupposes a very intimate acquaintance not only with the Scriptures, but also with the liturgy. Yet more exactly is that relation defined when we regard, for instance, the sermon which he delivers at the beginning of the Easter period. In this place we see presented in regular form a learned address on the significance of the Jewish paschal festival, and on the mode of calculating Easter.[1]

As regards the construction of the individual sermons, this is thoroughly artistic; all are exactly subdivided under their several heads.[2]

[1] *Cod. Vindob.*, No. 3691, 134*b*: "Notandum primo de mense, quod mensis accipitur dupliciter, uno modo pro mense solari, alio modo pro mense lunari. Mensis solaris accipitur secundum cursum solis et incipitur a Kalendis mensis et terminatur in Kalendis sequentis mensis, sicut Januarius incipit in circumcisione et terminatur in se," etc.

[2] 225*b*, Evangel.: "Cum turbe irruerunt," etc. Lucæ, 4to.

The design of these sermons as academic discourses is in various ways apparent. Repeatedly he addresses his students as "Dearest young men."[1] He not seldom derives his illustrations from students' customs; nor are there wanting hints of a practical kind for the preacher of the future. "If time remains to thee," he says in one passage, "thou mayest preach on this Gospel after the preceding one; otherwise take it up in the afternoon, or as best corresponds to the circumstances of thy hearers."[2] In another place he says, "As it is customary for the student on the completion of his studies to give evidence of the result of the same, in a public disputation, in which it is open to anyone to convict the disputant of error, provided an error is observed; so also the Jews thought of catching the Lord in a discourse."[3]

Very strongly also does it remind of the professor's chair, when he thus distinguishes the relation of the several evangelists to each other in the history

"Hoc evangelium dividitur in tres partes: 1, in prima ponitur Christi gloriosissima prædicacio, ibi: Cum turbe irruerunt; 2, in secunda ponitur virtutum eius miraculosa operacio, ibi: Ut autem cessit; 3, in tercia ponitur rei facte stupor et admiracio: Quos cum viderit."

[1] "Pueri carissimi."

[2] *Cod. Vind.*, 3691, 56*a*.

[3] "Consuetudo est, quod quando studentes volunt ostendere, quomodo studuerunt, et quando volunt recedere de studiis et magistrari, tunc offerunt se omnibus ad respondendum in publico . . . tunc quilibet potest arguere eos, ut sibi videntur male dixisse. Simili modo Christus volens recedere de studio huius mundi . . . in quo studio triginta tribus annis cum dimidio steterat, volens ostendere magisterium suum, dedit licenciam adversariis, qui contra eum sepe ante disceptaverant, quomodo eum capere possent." This passage has been strangely misunderstood by Friedjung, *l.c.*, p. 171.

of the passion. "Matthew relates the history of the passion more fully and exactly, and harmonises with Mark. Luke, on the other hand, omitting various things which these narrate, because he presupposes that they have already treated the subject, reports, however, divers particulars which Matthew and Mark have passed over. John, finally, wrote least of the sufferings of Christ; because he composed his gospel last, and likewise presupposed that the others had already related enough."[1]

If Konrad was by this collection of sermons meeting an expressed need of the students in Prague, it was at the same time far from his purpose to create drones. "People must study his sermons," he said, "in order to understand them properly; for they are right long and contain many obscure passages of old fathers and doctors."

As regards the contents of these sermons, we must ever bear in mind the end and object they were designed to serve. His hearers are one day to become teachers and priests of the people, and even to occupy the place where the preacher now stands. In accordance with the purpose of these sermons, we shall find them strongly marked on the ethical side. Doctrinal discussions rarely occur; polemical observations, save that they are throughout pointed against that which is evil, are altogether absent. The moral education of youth is that which lies nearest his heart. One of his first propositions is, he who will become a good preacher must begin

[1] *Cod. pal. Vindob.*, 3691, fol. 134, in the sermon, "Scitis quod post biduum pascha fiet."

with becoming a good man.[1] In no other sense, indeed, does he offer his postil to the students; no book can enable a bad man to become a good orator. Accordingly he animates his students to the attainment of the virtues, and seeks to exhibit to them the evil consequences of particular vices. He specially urges them to great zeal in the performance of their spiritual actions. The presentation is unadorned; often there is not wanting a certain drastic roughness, as when he relates that the saints sometimes have recourse to palpable means in order to incite the zeal of their clergy.[2] Among the vices he expressly attacked were avarice and licentiousness. In another connection we shall find him the warm opponent of gifts to mendicant friars. In the academic sermons we meet only with the remark, that to the gift which one presents certain conditions must be attached, to be fulfilled by giver and receiver. The dignity of the spiritual office he seeks in every way to maintain in high repute. Let the preacher so begin his labours in his parish, that his good name may spread over all the earth, and impress itself upon the hearts of all men.

Besides this ethical object, another is pursued in his sermons; and we may say that the latter bulks

[1] "Quicunque vult fieri bonus predicator, debet postponere omnes vanitates, sicut dicit Richardus Hugoni de St. Victore, cum ab eo quereret consilium: quomodo fieret valens doctor; respondit: Vis fieri bonus doctor, efficiaris prius bonus homo."

[2] "Legitur de beata Chunegunda, que cum in quodam monasterio sanctimonialium a se fundato quondam abbatissam haberet negligentem . . . quodam die dominico . . . manu sua dedit alapam" (the traces of which the abbess bore to her life's end).

far more largely in his eyes than the former. It is, namely, to furnish the gospels for the particular Sundays with a running commentary, advancing sentence by sentence through the gospel. In the exordium of some few sermons, the significance of each particular Sunday is set forth. The length of particular sermons, as also their intrinsic worth, is proportioned to the significance of the special Sunday. Owing to the popularity which this collection enjoyed in its day, and during the following decades, it was not only rapidly circulated, but also underwent manifold alteration. Konrad had already recognized as a defect in his discourses that some of them were too long; they were accordingly abbreviated, and thus there arose a second and considerably shorter redaction of his sermons. The real differences of the two redactions are unimportant;[1] for the most part it is purely formal elements which are omitted in the abbreviated form; the many paraphrases of one and the same thought, which he makes in the first redaction, are wanting in the

[1] Compare the *Codd. Vind.* 3691 and 4392:

3691.

"Quia hodie sancta mater ecclesia incipit officium divinum, quo per quatuor anni solaris tempora Christo suo sponso laudes iubilat et decantat per hoc recolere volens beneficia sibi per quatuor tempora magni anni scilicet ab origine mundi usque ad finem ipsius et a primo Abel iusto usque quo incepit et ad ultimum electum sibi ab eo facta et fienda . . . ."

4392.

"Hodie sancta mater ecclesia incipit officium divinum, in quo Christo suo sponso laudes decantat recolens beneficia sibi ab origine mundi usque ad finem eius impensa et perpetue impendenda: pro quo notandum, quod annus solaris habet quatuor tempora scilicet ver, estatem hyemem et autumpnum. Sic magnus annus id est tempus vite presentis ab inicio mundi usque ad finem."

second; in the latter he makes straight for the kernel of the matter.

As Konrad affords the young preacher a series of noteworthy hints and practical aids, so, moreover, he is inclined in the very introduction to his postil to lay down a theory on the art of preaching. "Let every preacher be on his guard against prolixity; that is one of the worst faults into which anyone can fall." He himself, as has been remarked, is not free from the fear that his discourses have grown a little too long; nevertheless he is consoled by the thought that the intelligent man will study them, and, where it is needful, will also abbreviate them: if the froth is skimmed off the top of them, they will then prove really serviceable; he compares them to meat, which is not good at its first swelling, but only when it is thoroughly cooked. A formal theory of "the art of preaching" he afforded in a special work.

In one way, he says there, we must preach to the monks, and in another to the laity; in one way to the townsmen, and in another to the peasants; according to the needs of the particular classes, according to their intelligence and capacities. One must reprove them with regard to particular sins; the preacher is not to flatter his hearers, but sternly to bring home to them their transgressions. In censure, however, one must exercise prudence. He specially warns against exposing to the laity the vices of the clergy. We learn from the accusations which were brought against him during his labours in Prague, that in his sermons to the people he was not true to his own theories. We should err if we supposed the true significance of the man was

to be measured by these academic sermons—the man who so sharply warred against the faults of his time. He does not willingly so much as touch in them on the affairs of the day. He speaks, it is true, on one occasion of the tournaments which are held at the courts of princes on Ash-Wednesday eve ; but not in order to inveigh against the extravagance of the princes, or to make kindred observations ; he rather avails himself of this fact for a comparison : as the princes exhibit by means of their knights and courtiers festal games in the days of Carnival, so also these two most mighty princes, God and the devil, hold at that time their jousts.

Of far greater significance were assuredly those sermons which he held before a greater public. Of these, however, as has been observed, no single one has come down to us ;[1] so that it seems doubtful whether he ever committed them to writing. So far as we are acquainted with Konrad's peculiarities, he cannot be ranged among the number of the mystics. There is lacking in him that depth of spiritual ardour which we find, for instance, in his successor Milicz ; from them he is further separated by his thoroughly practical aim, as this has already become apparent in the academic discourses. With emphatic severity he combats the luxury of the women, the frivolity and vanity of youth, and the practice of usury.[2]

[1] In Breslau there exists a MS. which contains sermons of Konrad, wherein are to be found some sharper attacks upon the clergy of his time.

The "Apologia Konradi in Waldhausen" in the *Geschichtschr. der husit. Bewegung*, ii. 17: "In omnibus sermonibus argui superbiam Pragensem, avariciam et luxuriam saltem in

The mendicant friars felt themselves touched by his discourses, as he turned his incisive words against their insatiable avarice; censured the chicanery which was practised in connection with relics; and warred against the stupid pride of the monks, who plume themselves upon the holiness of their founders, as well as the lying of the mendicant friars and their plundering of the poor people. "It is a folly," he exclaimed, "to run to the head of St. Barbara; for this is to be found in Prussia, but not in Prague." Or he admonishes his hearers: "Ye will not give to the poor, and yet ye throw away on the monks"—sturdy praters, he calls them—"who have more than they ought. Would there were only in every college *one* who should be deserving of such alms as these people swallow down their gullets!" This last expression, it is true, he toned down in his defence.

On account of these and similar reproaches the mendicant friars framed against the bold preacher a number of charges,[1] against which Konrad defended himself in a detailed apology, which is still in existence. The Duke Rudolph the Fourth, of Austria, summoned him to return to Vienna, but the obligation of gratitude towards the Emperor, who had conferred upon him the benefice, detained him at Prague; yet Konrad took care that the rumours scattered by malignant monks, and carried as far as Austria, should find there no receptive soil. He sent his apology to the Austrians, for whom it had,

prothematibus per prophetas." See the interesting instance of Hank (John) Bayer, a "Helmbrecht Stelzer" (qui in Austria dicuntur gamerati).

[1] The single phases of the suit see in Tomek, 288 ff.

properly speaking, been composed. Inasmuch as the sermons of Konrad aimed only at the elevation of the spiritual discipline, they leave the doctrine of the Church entirely untouched. That the effect they exerted was a powerful one is narrated to us by one of his contemporaries in his simple way.[1] Konrad's personal influence must have been indeed considerable, since, though a foreigner, he succeeded in attaining to such great results,[2] and his memory remained fresh in the country for nearly a half century. Yet among the younger men there is, besides Janow, only Andreas of Brod who mentions him;[3] that Hus ever occupied himself with his writings is a supposition which lacks any certain evidence in its favour.

Yet more powerfully than Konrad of Waldhausen did another preacher affect his contemporaries in Bohemia—MILICZ OF KREMSIER; thus, like Konrad, no native of the country. Ordained priest about 1350, he is afterwards engaged five years long in the imperial Chancery, namely, during the years 1358-1360 as *registrator*, and the two following years as *corrector*.[4] Besides this important post, he occupied further the dignity of a canon of St. Veit's, at the castle of Prague, as likewise of archdeacon and treasurer of the city church of Prague.[5] Weary of

[1] Benesch of Weitmühl, *ad ann.* 1369.

[2] "Cum esset nacione de Austria . . . veniens Boemiam correxit mores hominum patrie nostre, ita ut multi obmissis vanitatibus seculi sedula mente Deo servirent."

[3] *Gesch. der husitisch. Bewegung*, ii. 40. *Documenta magistri Joh. Hus*, 520.

[4] Lindner, *Das Urkundenwesen Karls*, iv. 20-23.

[5] The literature on Milicz, see in Palacky, *Vorläufer*, 18, and Friedjung, 172.

the pursuits of the world, he suddenly laid down his offices in the year 1363, to devote himself to preaching. The Archbishop Arnest reluctantly witnessed his departure. "Sir Milicz," he said to him, "what better can you do than to help your poor archbishop in tending the flock committed to him?" Milicz repaired to Bishop-Teinitz, and lived as chaplain in the parish there. Yet at the end of a half year he returned to Prague, and laboured first as preacher at St. Nicolas on the Kleinseite, and afterwards at St. Ægidius in the old town. His sermons were in the beginning but thinly attended: men were repelled by certain peculiarities of his Moravian dialect. Yet he soon attained a great degree of popularity, people were filled with admiration at his skill in embracing within a brief hour as much as other learned men in a week.[1] He was master likewise of the German language, and soon attained great results in his German preaching. With special zeal he applied himself to the study of the Apocalypse, and now it seemed manifest to him from divers tokens that the Antichrist was near, and the end of the world at hand: according to his calculation the time must be fulfilled in the years 1365—1367. The more nearly this period approached, the more loudly did his voice exhort to repentance: he denounces all who do not listen to his exhortation as possessed by the spirit of Antichrist, and does not even spare the heads of Christendom in his fierce accusations. "With manly

[1] Thus Albertus Ranconis de Enricinio speaks of him. Similar is the declaration of Mathias of Janow. See *Gesch. der hus. Bew.*, ii. 41.

courage," Janow tells us, "he reproved the highest prelates, the archbishops and bishops, regarding things in which they seemed to him to err." Nay, armed with his zeal as with a breastplate, he even made an assault upon the emperor, pointed to him with his finger, and told him in presence of all—it was at a great assembly in 1366—that *he* was the real Antichrist. For this, indeed, he was sentenced to a period of detention in prison. But this was of brief duration. In the year 1367 he went to Rome, where he waited for the arrival of Urban V., who was at length departing from Avignon. In Rome he wished to communicate his views to the Pope. Since the latter, however, remained longer absent than had been expected, Milicz proclaimed his conviction that Antichrist had already come, by attaching a placard to the portal of St. Peter's church. Thereupon the enthusiast was arrested, but was set at liberty again soon after the arrival of the pope, and even treated with distinction by the Cardinal de Albano.

Upon his return to Prague he evinced less ardour, indeed, upon the subject of Antichrist; but laboured the more ceaselessly as preacher and confessor. After the death of Konrad of Waldhausen, he received the living at the Teyn. The moral energy of his character failed not of producing its impression. It is related as something specially remarkable, that he reclaimed two hundred women of the town, and converted the place where hitherto offerings had been made to Venus (Venedig, Venice) into a religious foundation for fallen and penitent women. This place was called Jerusalem. Like Konrad, Milicz

also experienced the disfavour of the monks, who accused him to the Pope,[1] and in twelve points reproached him with his doctrine of the Antichrist, his severity against usury, his doctrine of the frequent reception of the Supper, the founding of Jerusalem, and his alleged aversion for the study of the liberal arts,[2] which he is said to have declared to be sinful. The Curia deemed it necessary to warn the diocese of Prague and Olmütz, Breslau and Cracow, against his doctrine; and the grief of the ecclesiastical prince, John Ocko of Wlaschim, was so great that Milicz himself had to console him. In the Lent season of 1374 Milicz went to Avignon, in order to purge himself from all suspicion. There he died on the 29th of June of this year, before any sentence had been pronounced in his case. Of the complaints against him no single one had reference to a definite dogma of the Church; without exception they were charges touching ecclesiastical life and Church constitution.

Among his works, the most popular were his little book on Antichrist, to which, in after times, Mathias of Janow, and Jacobell of Mies, made reference; and especially his sermons, which are extant to this day in very numerous manuscripts. Hence we can infer their great popularity.[3]

In those of his sermons which have come down to us there are wanting particular allusions to the

[1] See the points of accusation in Palacky, *Vorläufer*, p. 43.

[2] This expression aroused the anger of the people against the students. The latter were now called heretics. See Palacky, *Formelbücher*, i. 184: "Quod ipsi studentes heretici appellarentur."

[3] On his works, see Palacky, *Vorläufer*, 20.

circumstances of the time; they are directed in general against debauchery and avarice, hatred and arrogance. He had the power of carrying away his hearers. Thus he described in the most affecting manner the grief of the Virgin Mother; how in her heart there dwells a twofold love, and how this heart is rent by a twofold sorrow—love for her Son, and love for the human race; grief for the death of her Son, and grief for our perdition. The love for the human race overcomes even her love for her Son. He cites, indeed, passages from the Bible, but only to a moderate extent. He takes his similitudes by preference from nature and ordinary life.[1] All his sermons have a deeply ethical tone. In some few of his Latin discourses we meet with one and another severe expression, directed in particular against the avarice of the clergy and the laity.[2]

Among the precursors of the Hussite movement some in recent years would enumerate JOHN, the preacher of the Germans, in the church of St. Gallus; but the reasons for so doing do not seem to us to be cogent. It is true this Johannes wrote a work of large compass, the *Communiloquium*, which treats of the constitution of the State, and of its members, etc., and contains an abundance of fine and appropriate remarks; but, taken as a whole, it could appeal only to the educated classes of the land, because it was

[1] Comparison of human life with a torch, etc.

[2] Sermon *Invenit Jesus in templo:* "Ista avaricia adhuc hodierna die regnat in multis sacerdotibus, prelatis, et laicis. . . . A minore usque ad maiorem omnes student avaricie, a propheta usque ad sacerdotem cuncti faciunt dolum." From the *Sermones quadragesimales.*

intelligible only to them.[1] The remembrance of him, moreover, ceased with his death.

On the other hand, a much higher significance is claimed by the Magister ADALBERTUS RANCONIS DE ERICINIO, on whose life and labours a few works of the most recent years have shed some light.[2] He was one of the leading promoters of the literary and national aspirations in his native land, and as such enjoyed an undisputed reputation during his lifetime, and after his death his merits were long and often recalled to mind. He was made Master in the year 1348, and Rector at the University in Paris in 1355. With regard to him, Thomas of Stitny boasts, "He was the first among the Czechs who attained the degree of Magister in Holy Scripture at the University in Paris." In the years 1360—1370 he appears as professor at the University of Prague, and canon in the cathedral chapter there. In the year 1370 we find him engaged in an animated controversy with Henry of Oyta, whom he prosecuted before the Auditor of the papal chancery on account of six articles. Of these one reminds us of the similar doctrine of Hus (Wiclif): the Holy Ghost, and not the priest, forgives sins. It is the office of

[1] A table of contents is found in the *Concilia Pragensia*, xxxiv—xxxvi; comp. also Friedjung, 172.

[2] See, with regard to him, my Study in the 57th vol. of the *Archiv für österr. Geschichte*, 210 ff; and in the 17th vol. of the *Mitth. des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen*, 205. A few additions have been made by Tadra in the *Casopis mus. ceského*, 1880. An entry by his own hand is contained in the *Cod. un. Prag.*, iii., G. 1: "Isidori de summo bono 1: Iste est liber magistri Adalberti Ranconis de *Ericinio in Boemia*" (consequently a local name, and not a family name, as has been supposed) "scholastici ecclesie Pragensis magistri in theologia et in artibus Parisiensis."

the priest only to proclaim that the Holy Ghost has pardoned the sinner.

With the Archbishop John of Jenzenstein he was involved in the year 1385 in a warm controversy, which led to a formal literary duel, wherein three points were in dispute. The first was called forth by King Wenzel himself. One day the King, as was often his wont, in his castle of Pürglitz, addressed to the Magister a question relating to purgatory. According to the assertion of the Archbishop, the question was as follows: "Is it true, Master Adalbert, that there is no saint dwelling in heaven who has not previously descended into purgatory?" When Adalbert answered this question in the affirmative, the Archbishop joined in with the words, "Except the angels who have remained faithful." Adalbert, in displeasure, replied, "It is not true;" and the Archbishop, "Take heed, whether thou also hast rightly spoken." On this question they fell into lengthy argument. The second point respected the introduction of the Festival of the Visitation of the Virgin Mary (2nd July); the third and most important question turned on the right of escheatage. In this discussion the prebendary, Kunesch of Trebowel, first defended the views of the Archbishop, whereby he acknowledged himself a warm friend of the peasant class in Bohemia.[1] He claimed for them the right of freely

[1] See on this subject my essay, p. 232 ff. The treatise of John of Jenzenstein has now been given in a printed form by Kalousek (Prague, 1882). Hus treats the subject briefly in a sermon—*i.e.*, he brings forward for exposition the same passage of the Bible which is in question. That he was acquainted with the writings of Kunesch, Adalbert, and John of Jenzenstein is quite possible. See *Opp.*, ii. 35*b*.

disposing of their personal and real estate, even though the peasants should leave no direct heirs. John of Jenzenstein was himself once the author of a tractate from this point of view. Adalbertus Ranconis was engaged in manifold activity as a promoter of the literary interests of his countrymen. In this sense Stitny says of him, "He was not one of those who gnash with the teeth because I write such a work, or of those who calumniate everything because I have written in the Czechist language: it did not seem to him amiss to write books for Czechs in the language of the Czechs." As well Stitny, as other men, sought his learned counsel: contemporaries as those of younger age, and in particular Hus, speak of him with great reverence. As a warm friend of the interests of his people, he lived on terms of amity with men of kindred spirit, of the knightly and burgher orders, and notably with those two who had erected and endowed the famous Bethlehem Chapel, where the life-work of Hus was unfolded—namely, the merchant Kreuz, and the knight and royal counsellor John of Mühlheim. The latter founded at the said chapel a preachership, on the condition that the preacher should be a secular ecclesiastic, and should preach exclusively in the Czech language. In this circle of men of national spirit Adalbert represented the learned order, Mühlheim the knightly order, and Kreuz the burgher order. Like the two last-named, Adalbert also left behind him a foundation, which awakened interest in more than one respect.[1] He bequeathed, namely,

[1] The will was discovered by me in the Register Office at

a yearly disbursement on behalf of Czechian youths studying at Paris or *Oxford*. Thus without designing it—for Adalbert was himself a strict Churchman—he plays the part of a direct promoter of Wiclif's doctrines in his native land. The will of Adalbert was drawn up in Kreuz' house, and Kreuz himself was appointed an executor. His copious library he had already disposed of by will to the monastery of Brewnow. The terms of the above-named foundation show how high the waves of the national awakening were running so early as 1388. The foundation was for the benefit of such students as should devote themselves to the pursuit of the liberal arts, or of theology, in Paris or Oxford. They must, however, belong on the paternal and maternal side to the Czech nation. The administration of the funds was entrusted to the scholasticus of the Prague cathedral, but only on condition that he was a Czech. If this were not the case, the administration was to be undertaken by the dean for the time being of the cathedral chapter at Prague; he must nevertheless act on the advice of three prebendaries, who were likewise to be of Czech nationality. The revenues of the foundation were to be deposited with the scholasticus or the dean of the cathedral, who should remit the money to the aforesaid students in Paris or Oxford.

Adalbertus Ranconis was illustrious as a preacher also. Hus calls him the most lucid orator, and Janow designates him a great scholar "in the canon

---

Wittingau in the year 1878, and printed in the 17th vol. of the *Mitth.*, 210—213.

law and in theology."[1] Of his sermons there remains to us, unfortunately, but little—a synodal discourse of 1375, an address to the Cardinal Pileus, and a funeral sermon for Charles IV.[2] Stitny also, as he tells us, availed himself in important and doubtful matters of the counsel of Adalbert, and presented to him his work on general Christian affairs, with the request that he would improve in it everything that was not in accord with Holy Scripture.

As Adalbert Ranconis, so also was THOMAS of Stitny, who belonged to the order of the Bohemian nobility, a warm friend of the national interests, but moreover of the inner reform of the Church. As thus he lived on the one hand in close intimacy with Ranconis, he cultivated on the other hand a friendship for Milicz, into whose endeavours he warmly entered. Yet he never passed beyond the bounds of the prevailing ecclesiastical system. However deeply he was troubled, therefore, about the religious strifes which arose in Prague during the latter years of his life, and however much he was tortured with the thought that the right is not easily to be discovered, he consoled himself with the reflection, "The Church will, no doubt, decide what is right." He sought to influence his countrymen by means of his works for edification, composed in the language of the people; and the skill with which he wielded the copious forms of the Bohemian language is a matter

[1] "Limpidissimus orator," says Hus; "Opulentissimus . . . . magnus vir in iure canonico et in theologia," says Janow of him.

[2] The last of these is now printed in the *F. F. rerum Boh.*, iii., 433 ff.

for admiration even to the present day.[1] He has been likened to Thomas à Kempis: like the latter, he sought to bridge over the gulf between the school and the life by means of a popular presentation of the sum-total of the scholastic knowledge of his age, as he had apprehended it; and in this way to render accessible to the people that which the school had hitherto regarded as its exclusive property.[2] In these, his endeavours directed to practical ends, lies his significance, and it is in harmony with this fact that he employs his Sclavonic mother-tongue even for the purpose of learned disquisitions. Stitny lived to witness the first beginning of the genuine Hussite movement. He died about the year 1400.

Like Stitny, so Mathias of Janow was of knightly descent; he possessed, however, unlike the former, a learned education, which he had acquired partly in Prague, partly in Paris, where he had resided for a period of nine years.[3] On account of this latter circumstance they were wont to call him in his own land Mathias Parisiensis. The papal bull, which bestows upon him a canonry in the cathedral chapter

[1] Palacky, *Gesch. von Böhmen*, iii., 188.

[2] *Conc. Prag.*, 40.

[3] See Appendix, No. IV. In his principal writing he says, in contradiction with the document which speaks of six years, "Non enim indoctas fabulas secutus hec scribo, sed ea que *per novem annos* Parisius a magistris meis didici et reportavi et inde in universitate sancta Pragensi per octo annos continuos studendo .... conquisivi." We should be more inclined to suppose an error on the part of the papal chancery; for the MS. in which the notice of his nine years' residence in Paris is found is an autograph of the author's. Cod. iii., A. 10 univ. Prag., 1 in Marg.; Iste est liber mag. Mathie de Janow, 41, the same observation.

at Prague,[1] lauds his knowledge, the propriety of his life, and other praiseworthy merits.

Yet he himself confesses that, in his younger years, he pursued the glory and honours of the world, and in the seeking after riches fell into the snares of the devil.

He was on friendly terms with the magister Adalbertus Ranconis, and the archbishop John of Jenzenstein was favourably disposed towards him. The latter and Janow display in general striking points of analogy in their course of development, and perhaps the example of the upper shepherd was not without its influence upon Mathias. Like Mathias, the archbishop had visited foreign lands in order to complete his education ; and, like him, too, John of Jenzenstein was not at first averse to the pleasures of the world. If Mathias bewails that his spirit was once surrounded as by a dense wall, and thought only of that which delights eye and ear, until it pleased the Lord to snatch him as a brand from the midst of the flames ; so likewise Jenzenstein laments that he spent the fair days of his youth in vain trifles, in revel and riot, and in his wanderings up and down had acquired the world's vices, but not its virtues, until the hand of the Lord laid hold of him. Only in the burning fever, and when an icy chill ran through his bones, was the fleshly craving entirely slain in him ; only then did he put off the old man and put on the new man. The instantaneous death of the Archbishop of Magdeburg, who suddenly expired in the midst of the noisy pleasures of Shrove

[1] After he had previously held the office of parish priest in Magnavilla (Velikoves); see Tomek, *l. c.*, iii., 349.

Tuesday evening, produced an abiding effect on him. Jenzenstein, indeed, in his youth was not free from severe fits of asceticism. As Jenzenstein, so, finally, does Mathias of Janow frequently complain of the decay of discipline, and in particular of the worldliness of the higher clergy.

Mathias of Janow occupies in the present day the highest place among the so-called precursors of the Hussite movement; his significance, however, has manifestly been to some extent overrated, not as to the intrinsic value of his writings, but as to the influence which he exerted on the spiritual life of his time. We find in him, according to the statement of a modern historian, reformational ideas, which passed over from him to Hus.[1] Neander has, unfortunately, neglected to trace out these ideas, and to indicate them in detail. Hus, we are told, rather remained behind Mathias of Janow than outstripped him. In opposition to the last-named point it is to be observed that Mathias of Janow, like all his predecessors, held firmly to the traditions of the Church; and on repeated occasions sharply accentuates his concern not in any way to pass beyond the framework of ecclesiastical unity. Where is there found in his writings a proposition like that which serves as a foundation to Hus' doctrine of the Church, and was capable of subverting the existing order, not only in the Church, but also in the State? And as respects the first point, it cannot be shown that Hus employed, for instance, the works of Janow as his source in the presentation of his own religious views,

[1] Neander, *l. c.*, p. 252.

as we can demonstrate by convincing proof was the case with regard to the books of Wiclif. We could say at most that Hus found the way paved by men like Konrad, Milicz, Janow, and others, for the course he afterwards pursued. If this powerful influence in reality existed, it is very wonderful that Hus has not mentioned the names of his great predecessors, whereas, as a rule, he is not at all sparing of citations. Janow shares with Hus the love for biblical study: "From youth up I have loved the Bible, and called it my friend and bride, the mother of fair affection and of knowledge, of fear, and of sacred hope."[1] Nevertheless, when Hus speaks of the Bible he does not fall back upon Janow, but adopts the language of Wiclif. What Janow says of the Church sounds essentially different from that which we meet with in the tractates, sermons, and letters of Hus. Altogether, in consideration of the fact that Janow always remained within the framework of the dominant Church, it must be regarded as self-evident that Hus, in this respect, was not dependent on Janow. For precisely the doctrine of predestination as taught by Wiclif sufficed, in itself and in its consequences, to remove Hus from the ground of the Romish Church. In some other passages there is certainly to be perceived a resemblance in the subject-matter discussed by Janow and Hus.[2] It must, however, still be pronounced

[1] Palacky, *Vorläufer*, 60: "(bibliam) a iuventute mea adamavi et vocavi ipsam amicam et sponsam meam, immo matrem pulchræ dilecionis et agnicionis et timoris et sanctæ spei."

[2] Such an agreement one discovers where Hus speaks of the frequent reception of the Supper. Formally, indeed, the

open to doubt—seeing that certain questions in Bohemia were at that time pretty generally discussed—whether we have here to presuppose an influence exerted by the writings of Janow. That which is observed by Janow in opposition to the reproach of having disclosed the vices of the clergy, and thereby caused a scandal to the laity, reminds of the like situation in which we behold Hus twenty years later. As Janow, so Hus, too, said he had intentionally exposed the hypocrisy and corruption of the monks, and exhorted his disciples to be on their guard against the doctrines of these men. In some passages it seems as though Hus had before his mind the reasoning of Mathias of Janow. But if one looks a little more closely, one perceives, after all, only passages of Holy Scripture, which Hus happens to have in common with Janow. Regarding one and another of these texts, however, it can be proved that Hus did not take them

---

agreement is not present, because Hus wrote the treatise in question while in prison :—

Cod. O. cap. 7. Prag.

In primitiva ecclesia omnes, qui erant in officio misse tam laici quam clerici, communicabant . . . postea statutum fuit, omnibus diebus dominicis communicare . . . postea institutum fuit ter in anno communicare et quod homines adhuc negligentes erant, Innocencius III. instituit semel in anno videlicet festo Pasche . . .

Hus Opera I. 81 b.

Primi enim christiani, qui erant ferventes . . . manducabant quotidie, procedente vero tempore refrigescente charitate manducabant diebus dominicis . . . Postea a frequenti communione recesserunt. Propter quod statutum fuerat, ut in summis saltem festivitatibus . . . manducarent et invalescente avaricia statutum est, ut saltem semel in anno . . . circa festum Pasche manducarent.

direct from the Bible, but derived them from Wiclif.[1]

That, for the rest, in Janow's great work no trace of Wiclif's influence is to be detected has already been observed by another.[2] Yet Janow's renown is not diminished, as that of Hus is not augmented, though the influence of the former upon the latter is not discernible, or not discernible in the same measure as has been hitherto believed. Janow was certainly a most significant figure, and deserves in reality the place which has heretofore been conceded to him among the friends of reform in Bohemia at the close of the fourteenth century. He appears as most zealously active in favour of the restoration of Church discipline, and in opposition to the abuses prevalent in the Church.[3] His writings, so far as they are known to us, would assuredly meet with the approval of the Archbishop, John of Jenzenstein, who strove after the same objects with all the passion of his nature, and likewise displayed a very considerable

[1] So, *e.g.*, Hus, *Opera*, 209 *b*; comp. herewith Mathias (Palacky, *Vorläufer*, 66). Hus adopted his form of argument there from Wiclif, *de ecclesia*, cap. 2. An edition of Janow's works were greatly to be desired. Only then could one settle once for all this so important question of the history of Hus' course of development.

[2] Palacky, *Gesch. von Böhmen*, III. 1. 190, note 238. It is true Palacky does not mention his authority for this fact. In his book *Die Geschichte des Husitenthums*, p. 113, Palacky confesses that "he has never read Wiclif's writings." All the same his view is correct, as is evident from a comparison of Wiclif's writings with acknowledged specimens from Janow's works.

[3] A very comprehensive analysis of his principal work is to be met with in Neander, 252—310.

literary activity.[1] The writings of the archbishop have a strongly ascetic flavour about them. A number of letters bear sufficient testimony to his diligent endeavours for the elevation of the clergy. While the work of Jenzenstein was specially designed for the educated classes, Janow appeals to the "simple people in Christ," for whom "his book is alone" intended.[2] In reality we may say that the work of Janow, although proceeding from a very well-read man, is free from all kind of bombast, and in particular avoids piling citation upon citation. In consequence it is so much the more easily intelligible, and affords more pleasant reading. In keeping with this is the fact that but comparatively few dogmatic discussions are met with in this work; the main stress is laid upon *the practice* of Christianity. The five books treat: 1. Of the communion of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament of the Church; there is here no question of Utraquism; 2 and 3. Of the judging and distinguishing between true and false Christians, and above all of pseudo-prophets and doctors; 4 and 5. Of the frequent communion and administration of the true body and blood of Christ.

Most forcibly has Janow spoken and written against the abuses practised in the worship of images and relics.[3] Nor was it in accordance with

[1] See Palacky, *Italienische Reise*, 57; and my edition of the *Cod. Epistolaris* of J. v. Jenzenstein, *l. c.*, 272 ff.

[2] "Et quia hunc librum conscripsi *solum* ad simplices Christi et devotos."

[3] On this point, also, the argument of Hus is not founded on that of Janow, although the occasion would so naturally present itself. Where Hus speaks of the veneration of images

his wish that the people were refused frequent participation in the Supper. "The doctors say very much in the schools, which must not by any means be preached in this form to the common people; although the holy Church has permitted the reverence of images, yet she has never taught that they are to be worshipped. Nevertheless there are now many great and renowned men who say that such things are profitable for the simple." Janow alludes to the excessive veneration of images, and the crying up of the miracles wrought by them. Such doctrines of Janow naturally gave offence. The Synod of Prague, of the year 1389, demanded of him a retractation, which he made on the 18th October of this year.

That he was wont to preach in the mother tongue is evident from the remark which he makes in opposition to the charge of having exposed the wickedness of the clergy before the people in the language of the country. In expounding a text of Scripture he says: "Here those are manifestly refuted who say that we must not expose the faults of the clergy in the language of the country." That he means thereby the Czech language appears from the presence of certain Czech words which he has introduced into the Latin text in the chapter on the veneration of the images of the saints.[1]

According to the testimony of an almost contemporary hand, Mathias of Janow died on the

(*Opera*, II. 341 *b*) he employs the words of Wiclif in his treatise *de imaginibus;* see thereon the second part of this work.

[1] Palacky, *Vorläufer*, 50.

30th of November, 1394, and was buried in the Metropolitan Church at St. Veit.

Among the friends of reform is also to be reckoned JOHN OF STEKNO, who has long been confused with Konrad of Waldhausen.[1] Hus in one of his sermons calls him "the excellent preacher with the trumpet voice."[2] That he was intimately allied to the circle of men, such as Mühlheim, Crux (Kreuz), and Adalbertus Ranconis, is apparent from a document which places him in the closest connection with the said merchant.[3] If Stekna appears on the one hand as a favourer of that tendency which aimed in word and writing to promote the use of the language of the country, on the other hand it is manifest that he never abandoned the strictly ecclesiastical standpoint. On this question we might content ourselves with the testimony of Andreas of Brod, a passionate opponent of the whole school of Wiclif,[4] who ranks him, with regard to his labours, side by side with a Konrad of Walhausen and a Milicz; yet more clearly is this fact apparent from the consideration that Stekna was a violent champion of the indulgence which was granted for Prague in the year 1393. "This year of Jubilee," says the Chronicle of the Prague University, "has emptied the pockets of the poor.[5] Wenzel retained the greater part of

[1] The true state of the matter was brought to light by Palacky, *Vorläufer*, 82 ff.

[2] "Johannes Stekna veluttuba resonans predicator eximius." Hus, *Opera*, ii.

[3] *M. M. hist. univ. Prag.*, ii. 362. That he was also preacher at the Bethlehem chapel we learn from *Chron. Univ. Prag., ad ann.* 1392.

[4] *Doc. mag. Joannis Hus*, 520.
Hofler, *Geschichtschr.*, i. 14.

the money for his exchequer, and there was none among all the doctors and masters who set himself as a bulwark to oppose the wickedness of the simony. But all, as though they had been dumb, offered a bad example,[1] and ran about with rude and uncultivated people in the said churches to obtain the so dearly purchased indulgence. Wenzel Rohle alone, the priest at the church of St. Martin in the Old Town, spoke not of indulgences, but called them fraudulences; it is true not openly, but secretly for fear of the Pharisees. Master Stekna, too, at that time authorised preacher in Bethlehem, admonished the people not to neglect so excellent a grace." And when, a decade later, the passionate controversy broke out about the doctrines of Wiclif, and in particular with regard to the remanence of the bread, Stekna took up his position in the most advanced rank of the ecclesiastical champions.[2] Yet this is the point at which the Reformational movement in Bohemia, which had hitherto borne no other character than that we find attached to it in Germany, France, and other lands, now enters upon a new path. This last among the precursors was likewise the first who arose to maintain a polemic attitude towards Wiclifism. His treatise—probably dealing with the question of the remanence of the bread at the transmutation—is now lost.

[1] As regards the worth of the chronicle, see Palacky, *Die Geschichte des Husitenthums*, etc., 17 f. This passage, we may observe, presupposes an acquaintance with the writings of Hus.

[2] See thereon the letter of Hus belonging to the year 1413, in the *Doc.*, 56.

CHAPTER III.

THE FIRST CONTROVERSY ON THE LORD'S SUPPER.

THE conflict with regard to the cup arose in Prague after Hus had already been snatched from the scene of his previous activity. We have to look upon this conflict as the last phase of the numerous disputes on the Supper, which were conducted for more than a generation in the pulpits and lecture-rooms of Bohemia. There is no doubt but this last phase is of greater importance than any of the previous ones, for the conflict regarding the cup imparted, from the year 1415, a greatly altered direction to the Hussite movement: the separation of parties now became a pronounced and outwardly visible one.

More than a decade before this, the doctrine of Wiclif concerning the Supper had found an entrance into Bohemia, and it was this mainly against which all the attacks of the adversaries of Hus and of the new tendency were directed. Hus and his companions had drawn down upon themselves the hatred of their opponents, just because they were looked upon by these men as adherents of Wiclif in respect of his doctrine of the remanence of the bread.

Long before, from the years 70—80 of the four-

teenth century, another question was debated with great animation—namely, whether it was lawful for a man frequently, or even daily, to partake of the Supper?[1] There is hardly a man of any literary magnitude of that period who did not make himself heard on this question. Mathias of Janow expressed himself thereon with the greatest fulness of detail. The whole of his fifth book, "On True and False Belief," is taken up with the doctrine of the Supper, and contains lengthy contemplations and elaborate discussions on the utility of frequent or even daily communion.[2] Mathias pleads in favour of oft-re-

[1] "De communione quotidiana," *Geschichtschr. der husit. Bewegung*, ii. 60. MSS. which contain the views of the most renowned scholars of that age on this subject are still numerous; comp. *e.g.*, the Cod. O. 7 in the Library of the Cathedral Chapter at Prague. It is there said: "Incipit prologus magistri Mathie super duodetriginta doctores pro quotidiana vel crebra communione corporis (et sanguinis) Christi a plebeiis Christianis." The words enclosed in brackets indicate that the addition was first made in the Hussite period itself. With Utraquism the above question has nothing to do. The Cod. O. 7 dates at the earliest from the middle of the fifteenth century.

[2] Comp. *Cod. un. Prag.*, A. 10, 102—176. The first distinction treats:—

1. "De discrecione manducancium sacramentum corporis et sanguinis domini. Three things are sufficient, that the Christian communicate daily, or at least frequently: Discussio divini sacramenti et probacio vel cognicio sui ipsius et sanus appetitus ad corpus Christi.

2. "De manducantibus non indigne sacramentum. Sepe confiteri peccata et manducare corpus Christi est saluberrimum exercicium. Omnibus eciam plebeiis expedit sepe frequentare sumpcionem sacramenti. Omnibus plebeiis cotidie licet sumere sacramentum. Eciam coniugatis licet et expedit in octo diebus semel sumere sacramentum. Periculosum est omnibus plebeiis et coniugatis abstinere diucius quam per octo dies a sacramento, etc. . . .

3. "De hiis qui indigne sumunt corpus et sanguinem Jesu

peated, and under some circumstances daily, communion. But he is not the first who has treated this question in a literary way.

In his work itself he makes mention of his predecessors in this domain. "It must be known," says Mathias, "that now-a-days a question is greatly mooted, at least by ordinary and plain folk; and that is the question of the daily or frequent reception of the sacred body on the part of the people. Some preachers permit the same, and invite the people to the oft partaking of the sacred body; others set themselves against this, and dissuade the people therefrom, under the be-

Christi. . . . In primitiva ecclesia cottidie communicabant plebeii . . . ideo est nunc sepe populo dei sumendum dei sacramentum.

4. "De communione sacramenti cotidiana in primitiva ecclesia.

5. "De modis et habitudinibus corporis Jesu Christi.

6. "De statuis in templis et imaginibus, que distrahunt honorem dei sacramenti" (Abstracts in Palacky, *Die Vorläufer des Husitenthums in Böhmen*, 78, 79).

7. "De plenitudine sacrificii in altari . . . Manducacio crebra huius sacrificii nostri totum hominem sanat intus et extra in anima et corpore.

8. "De excusacionibus irracionabilibus non frequentandi . . . Sumentes cotidie vel frequenter Christi Jesu corpus et sanguinem magis ipsum per hoc honorant quam illi, qui ob reverenciam Christi corporis dissuadent et repellunt a sacramento christianos; magis per hoc inhonorant Jesum Christum crucifixum et eius sacramentum.

9. "De quibusdam naturalibus impedimentis frequentandi divinum sacramentum . . . Qualiter coniugati se gerere debent . . . mulier menstruata non est prohibenda a frequenti sacramenti communione . . . Homines qui habent propositum firmum continendi non impediuntur per pollucionem in sompniis a frequenti sacramenti sumpcione . . .

10. "De racionabilibus excusacionibus a frequenti communione sacramenti abstinendi."

The two last distinctions are wanting in this MS.

lief that frequent communion is not salutary for them." [1]

From this declaration of Mathias we perceive that not only learned groups, but even the common people, were for a time held under the power of an intense interest in this question. Mathias himself examines which of the two parties has on its side the authority of Scripture, the utterances of the fathers, and the views of learned men. The opinion of Mathias met with widespread approbation, as we must conclude from the repeated occurrence of this judgment in ancient MSS. The other judgments, too, are still to be found in ancient MSS. Thus, for instance, we form the acquaintance, in a MS. of the Prague cathedral chapter, [2] of all those men who, during the fourteenth century, wrote on the frequent reception of the communion, and we find in it the proof passages that could be adduced in favour thereof. Mathias of Janow heads the array. In the second place is mentioned John Horlean, doctor of theology and of Canon Law, who, in dealing with the thesis, whether a layman might come forward once each week to partake of the Supper,[3] returned an affir-

[1] *Cod. un. Prag.*, III. A. 10. "Sciendum est quippe, quod in temporibus que nunc currunt questio multum invaluit, saltem inter communes et simplices de manducacione cotidiana vel crebra a plebeiis . . . et quidam doctores vel predicatores concedunt ut dictum est et invitant populos ad cotidianam vel crebram sacramenti altaris participium corporale . . . alii sunt, qui ex adverso reclamant et contrarium nituntur summis conatibus inducere et persuadere videlicet, quod nequaquam sit bonum sepe laicos Christi corpore et sanguine saciari."

[2] See above.

[3] "Queritur an persona laica possit singulis septimanis suscipere Corpus Christi."

mative answer. In the third place is mentioned the magister and canon, Franciscus of Heiligenkreuz in Breslau, director of the parish there. The frequenting of the sacrament once a week was advocated by him,[1] as also by his countryman and colleague, the Master Wendelar, Dean of Heiligenkreuz.[2] A high reputation was enjoyed, in his day, by Mathæus of Cracow, Doctor of Theology at the University of Prague.[3] He was made Bishop of Worms in 1405. On account of his services he was created chancellor, by King Rupert. He died in March 1410. How great was the authority he enjoyed as Professor of Theology at the University of Prague is evident from the fact that the university appointed him envoy to the Pope Urban VI. He was one of the most enthusiastic advocates of Church reform. Even the theme which he chose for his discourse in the presence of Urban VI. is highly characteristic.[4]

[1] "Omnibus diebus dominicis communicandum hortor, si tamen mens in affectu non sit. . . . "

[2] "Quia non est dies, quo non sit opus huius percepcione."

[3] See Ullmann, *Die Reformatoren vor der Reformation*, i. 279. Palacky, Lechler, and others speak of him also as Mathæus of Krakow, in Pomerania, but in Andrew of Ratisbon I find the passage:—"Secundum quod petivit, quod ea mortua erigeret studium generale in Cracovia quod eciam fecit et hoc principaliter per magistrum Mathæum qui postea factus est episcopus Wormaciensis, quem ad hoc specialiter vocavit, *eo quod de Cracovia esset oriundus*." Höfler, *Geschichtschr.*, ii. 433. In the Prague university register likewise he is named Mathæus de Cracovia; see *Mon. hist. un. Prag.*, i. 135. Repeatedly do Poles receive under him the Master's degree; see *ibid.*, 180, 197.

[4] "Sermo quem fecit magister Mathæus, scilicet de Cracovia, sacre theologie doctor coram Urbano Papa VI., cum esset ambasciator studii Pragensis." The theme runs thus:—"Quomodo facta est meretrix civitas fidelis." (MS. of the Olmütz Studienbibliothek.) He enlarges on the thought how difficult

Mathæus of Cracow is the author of a tractate, in which reason and conscience hold a dialogue on the duty of partaking of the communion.[1] This tractate, which was exceedingly popular in its time, and was translated into the national languages—namely, German and Czech—reminds in many respects of the writings of German mystics. The understanding stimulates the conscience to a more frequent partaking of the sacrament; the latter hesitates from excessive fear. Then the understanding discusses the nature of the sacrament of the altar, in which the Godhead is mysteriously contained. To partake of this must afford infinite solace and profit. It is laid on the priest as a duty to present the same. Yes, thinks the conscience—and we find here a note of accord with the corresponding doctrine of the

it is to speak in presence of the Pope; but yet more perilous is it to be silent, where one can aid in an effectual manner in freeing Christendom of its sufferings. Never were there so many Antichrists as now: "innumerabiles sunt defectus et mala clericorum, et ob hoc incurabilis videtur esse morbus." The Church can be reformed only "si rectores lucerent doctrina salutari, eminerent vita exemplari, ferverent zelo regulari." He speaks also against first-fruits and procuration moneys. Of like contents also is his writing, *De squaloribus curiæ Romanæ* (see Walch, *Monumenta medii ævi*, i.), which was composed between 1389 and 1403 (Lechler, *l. c.*, 133).

[1] "Tractatus de quodam conflictu racionis et conciencie de communione eukaristie sacramenti" (*Cod. Bibl. Mellicensis*, M. 19), is to be met with in all the larger libraries of Austria, Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, etc.; *e.g.* Wittengau, Breslau, Prague. As a contest of reason: Prague Univ. Library, xvi. F. 8, etc. In addition to those works of Mathæus of Cracow, which are already mentioned in Balbin, *Bohemia docta*, I make further mention of a Tractatus de contractibus, Tractatus de arte moriendi, De disposicione communicantis, exposicio super Cant. Canticorum, Epistolæ, and four others, in the Breslau University Library. Smaller works in Codd. 1 Q. 372, 383. Breslau Town Library, 1606.

Wiclifites—the priest, who is himself in a condition of sin, cannot worthily administer it, at least before God, who knows everything, and if he does it, notwithstanding, it redounds to the hurt of the people, and still more of himself. The understanding now speaks much about the sweetness of the sacrament, of which one ought to partake, when the Godhead as it were commands it. In this strain the dialogue continues.[1] We see that Mathæus of Cracow, too, is in favour of the frequent reception of the communion.

Adalbertus Ranconis de Ericinio, likewise, at the request of the priest of St. Martin's by the Hospital, in the old town of Prague, made known his judgment on the question in dispute.[2] He cannot pronounce an unqualified commendation of the practice of frequently communicating; he speaks of the perils of an unworthy communion. Yet he has no wish to discourage therefrom, for it is at all events more praiseworthy to partake of this sacrament than to refrain from it, seeing that it enkindles, augments, and strengthens love.[3]

To the judgment of Adalbertus Ranconis, the Minorite Daniel has respect, in his work "De septem profectibus religionis."

[1] "Error plurimorum qui multum affligunt se, ieiunant, orant, et vigilant eciam in tantum, quod sensus obruitur et ab omni devocione impeditur pocius quam promovetur, et habent aliqua de viciis in se," etc. . . . The further analysis, see in Höfler, *Concilia Pragensia*, LV.

[2] "Determinacio venerabilis Adalberti Ranconis, magistri in artibus et doctoris, ... dilecto suo Martino plebano ad sanctum Martinum prope hospitale civitatis maioris Pragensis."

[3] "Laudabilius est ad hoc sacramentum accedere, quam se abstinere."

One of the most renowned monks of the Königsal cloister, who is often spoken of as the author of the "Malogranatum,"[1] and whose piety, as is told to his praise, was so great that he laid down the abbacy for the sake of his devotion, likewise expressed himself in a dissertation in favour of frequent communion.

With special warmth and fervour did a "venerable man and illustrious preacher"—his name is not given in all MSS., but it is no other than Milicz[2]—likewise enter upon this subject. This he did in his postil, which he entitled "Gracia Dei"—the grace of God. This illustrious preacher advocated the daily, or at least frequent, observance of the communion.[3]

Then a series of earlier testimonies are adduced. First the unknown author of the tractate, "De septem sacramentis et de Eucharistia;" then Simon de Cassia, in his tractate, "ad Abolendos cotidianos defectus;" this is followed by the decision of the masters of a certain college,[4] the views of the magister Bonaventura, of the magister Amandus in his tractate, "Horologium Sapiencie." Further we find the gloss on the passage from 1 Cor. xi., "Qui enim manducat;" then the verdicts of Thomas de Aquino, Bernard of Clairveaux, Alanus, Innocent III., in his book on the Mass,[5] then of Cassianus, Anselm, Cæsarius, Crisarius, St. Augustine, Ambrose,

[1] It is the Abbot Gallus.

[2] As he is also named in the text of Höfler, ii. 61.

[3] "Donec illo æternaliter saciemur;" see the *Geschichtschreiber der husit. Bewegung*, ii., 61.

[4] "Determinacio magistrorum cuiusdam collegii."

[5] *In libro de missa.*

Jerome, Anacletus, and St. Paul. Altogether twenty-eight witnesses are cited, and then the historic development of the subject is briefly set forth. "In the early Church, all who attended the mass, clergy and laity, received the communion; afterwards it was fixed that the communion should be received only on Sundays; from the days of the Pope Fabian it became the custom to approach the Supper thrice in the year, and from the time of Innocent III. the regulation was made that people should communicate at least once in the year, to wit, at Easter."

We see how not only monks, but also, and in particular, learned circles were intently occupied with the doctrine of the Supper. In the first place, it is true, on that practical side which has been above discussed. For the rest, the number of those who have taken up the pen on this question is not exhausted with the persons above named. The same object was pursued by the Olmütz official, Sander.[1] He advocated, in general, the more frequent reception of the communion; yet he, too, like Mathias of Janow, has some scruples, and the reasons he brings forward against daily communion are mostly similar to those of Mathias.

Of this lively movement the Synodal Statutes of Prague likewise bear witness. The synod of the

[1] A MS. of the Olmütz *Studienbibliothek* (II. vi. 25) contains a tractate, "Hec sunt extracta per dominum officialem magistrum Sanderum pro domino Petro beate memorie contra murmurantes et impedire volentes sacram communionem." Sander was in the year 1399 prebendary in Olmütz. In *Cod.*, II. iv. 11, the observation is met with: "Istum librum ligavit m. Zanderus can. Olom. et dedit domui vallis Josaphat 1399, tempore domini Stephani," *i.e.*, the well-known opponent of Hus, Stephen of Dolein.

year 1389, at which Mathias of Janow retracted some of his doctrines, entered also upon a course of opposition to the urgency, now becoming more and more impetuous, with which a daily participation in the communion was sought. "In like manner," reads the retractation of Mathias, "I say that people of the secular order are not to be invited to a daily participation in the communion. In like manner, not everyone who is in the first stage of his repentance is straightway to be urged to receive the sacrament. So likewise not everyone without distinction is to be admitted to the communion of the Lord's body."[1] The sentence pronounced by the synod upon Mathias was that he be suspended for half-a-year from hearing confessions, and administering the sacrament beyond the limit of his own parish church.

In the recantation there is, as will be seen, no word of the Supper under *both* forms, and the magister, John of Rokyzan, who maintained in presence of the Council of Basle that Mathias of Janow was the first who favoured the communion under two kinds, has manifestly the above judgment before his mind, which is uttered only against the daily reception of the sacrament. How little Mathias was reconciled to the decision of the synod is evident from his melancholy exclamation: "Ah, wretched man that I am! they have compelled me by their furious bawling at that synod to join in saying that

[1] Although *De Janow* (as is read by Höfler, *Conc. Prag.*, 37, and Palacky, *Doc.*, 699) does not stand in the MS., yet there is no reason to doubt that the revocation pertains to Janow.

believers in general are not to be invited to daily communion."

Into these endeavours Hus likewise enters. In his tractate composed during his imprisonment at Constance, he still expresses himself on the more frequent reception of the sacrament of the altar, in similar, if not identical, language with that of Janow and his predecessors. He looks upon it as wickedness that men will communicate only in the hour of their death, or not even then.[1] This, however, is one of the not very numerous points on which, as already observed, we find Hus in harmony with one of his so-called precursors. Yet in connection with this, it is not of necessity to be assumed that Hus was led by Janow in particular to the consideration of these matters.

[1] "Sed iam vult consummari malicia, quod quidam tantum in agone mortis volunt et alii nunquam manducare dominicum sacramentum." Hus, *Opera*, i. 41 *b*.

CHAPTER IV.

WICLIFISM IN BOHEMIA.

THE last years of Wiclif's life were spent in the parish of Lutterworth, where he himself held the office of parish priest. There he died, on Sylvester's Day, 1384. His adherents, upon whom was bestowed the name of Lollards during the first years after his death, already formed a strong party. Until the year 1395 they struck ever deeper roots among the people, so that they could cherish the hope of being able to carry into effect a radical reform in the ecclesiastical and political affairs of England. It was only when Thomas of Arundel occupied the see of Canterbury in 1396, and in particular when the new dynasty of Lancaster ascended the throne of England, 1399, that State and Church combined their efforts for the extirpation of Wiclifism. In swift succession the deadly blows followed one another. After the University of Oxford had been subjected to a thorough purgation, the highest authorities among the doctors there pronounced two hundred and sixty-seven propositions out of Wiclif's writings to be erroneous and heretical. When, afterwards, in the year 1417, Sir John Oldcastle, the good Lord Cobham, died at the stake, the Lollards

were at length forced from a position which compelled respect, and driven to occupy a situation wherein they appeared more and more as sectaries.[1] Henry IV., and, yet more, his son of the same name, persecuted them with unrelenting severity: "Henry V. unfurled the banner against them," says the Hammer of the Wiclifites, Thomas Netter, of Walden.[2] The followers of Wiclif were now looked upon not only as the enemies of God, but also as enemies of the King; the ecclesiastical and secular interests were blended in a common cause. As enemies of the King, the Wiclifites were to be hanged; as heretics, to be burned.

To the introduction of these severe measures, the things which were being enacted in Bohemia beyond doubt contributed in no slight measure. In that land had arisen—certainly as early as 1403, perhaps somewhat earlier—an apostle of Wiclif's doctrine, who proclaimed, at first softly and with hesitation, but afterwards with ever augmenting zeal and lasting effect, the doctrines of the English master. It was JOHN OF HUSINEC, as he is called in the earliest authentic documents, or, as he was wont to call himself from the year 1396, simply HUS. Neither the day nor the year of his birth is found noted down by

[1] Lechler, *Johann von Wiclif*, ii. 107.

[2] "Doctrinale fidei ecclesie prolog.: Rex Henricus V. in ipso regni sui primordio primo contra Wiclefistas hereticos erexit vexillum . . . . Omnes Wiclefistæ sicut Dei proditores essent, sic proditores regni." With regard to the subsequent quotations made in this chapter, be it observed that Netter looks upon the Bohemian incidents simply as the extension of the Wiclifite movement. His polemic in general is directed only against Wiclif, *never* against Hus. "Scripturus contra Wiclefistas, . . . qui hodie totam invasere Bohemiam." Wiclif is for him the third Herod, etc.

any early authority. On the testimony of a later and uncertain source, 1369 has been accepted as the year of his birth. If within recent years the 6th July has been assigned as the day of his birth,[1] the reason is to be sought only in the incident that the 6th July has been observed in Bohemia as Hus' anniversary—certainly not because this was his birth-day, but the day of his death; in a certain sense, it is true, the day of his birth. That the 6th July was observed as the day of the "*holy martyr*" Hus, is quite distinctly remarked in sources belonging to the Hussite period.[2] His parents seem not to have been particularly well-to-do. Hus, as afterwards Luther, passed the first years of his student life in a state of privation; by singing in the churches, and by menial services, he earned his bread.[3] He had several brothers and sisters. About the sons of a brother—the brother himself seems to have been already dead—he manifested a touching concern, even during the last days of his life. They were to be put to a trade; for he was afraid lest, if they should devote themselves to the spiritual estate, they might not be able to preserve this sufficiently holy.[4]

He himself in early youth contemplated the clerical office. According to his own words, he had mainly in view, in so doing, the comfortable life led by the clergy.

[1] Tomek, *Dejepis Prahy*, iii. 433; Lechler, *l. c.*, ii. 133.

[2] See my essay on Nicholas Tempelfeld, *Arch. für öst. Gesch.*, 61, 99, 1.

[3] Tomek, *l. c.*, 433.

[4] *Doc. mag. Hus.*, 120: "Recommendo tibi fratres meos . . filios fratris . . mei, dispone ad artificium . . . . quia timeo, ne si venirent ad statum spiritualem, illum non servent sicut deberent."

The higher studies he pursued in Prague. His successes in study do not seem to have attracted the attention of his teachers to him: it is observed that in the series of those who graduated with him he is always mentioned in the middle.[1] Of his teachers he made mention in after life; above all, of the magister Stanislas of Znaim, with whom it is well known he lived during his last years in bitter feud. Stephen of Palecz, too, his chief opponent at the council, unquestionably exerted great influence upon him. In a sermon preached by him on the commemoration day of Charles IV.,[2] he passes in review the men who had made a deep impression on him: "What would our teachers, the professors of sacred theology, say, if they could still answer? What Master Nicholas, with the appellation Biceps, the acute dialectician; Adalbertus Ranconis, the most eloquent orator;[3] Nicholas of Leitomischl, the excellent counsellor; Stephen of Kolin, the ardent friend of his country; John Stekna, the preacher with the trumpet voice; Peter Stupna, the admirable musician?" He, moreover, speaks with affection of the mathematician Janko, and of the distinguished poet Rachorowitz. Of special inclinations of Hus we

[1] Palacky, *Gesch. v. Böhmen*, iii. 1, 191.

[2] "Sermo in commemoracione Karoli imperatoris, pronunciatus ad S. Clementem prope pontem Pragæ." *Opera*, ii. 40 ff.

[3] Adalbert died in 1388. During this year he was prevented by illness from giving his lectures (his will bears date of 3rd March). That he was long confined by suffering appears from a letter of Jenzenstein (*Arch. öst. Gesch.*, 55, 132). The year 1387 must accordingly have been lost for his work as a teacher, and Hus must have been his pupil before this. Consequently, on this ground also, the birth of Hus cannot be placed in 1369.

learn but little. In his testament, which he drew up in the form of a letter, addressed to his disciple Martin, he bewails that he once found delight in certain outward things—the wearing of fine clothes, etc.,—led astray, as he adds in a tone of excuse, by the evil habitude of man.[1] He also took a liking for chess. Of his passionateness and arrogance, and in particular of his shrewdness, various instances are given; that his studies did not extend beyond the circle of scholastic theology has been pointed out within the last few years.[2]

In September 1393 he graduated as Bachelor of Arts, a year later as Bachelor of Divinity, and finally, in 1396, as Master of Arts. The doctor's degree he never took. From the year 1398 he delivered lectures as a public teacher at the university. Here he must have risen quickly in general estimation, for in a short time offices and dignities were bestowed upon him; in 1401 he was made dean of the faculty of philosophy, and in the following year rector. The rectorship he occupied for a half year—namely, up to the end of April 1403.

To men like Andrew of Brod, Stephen of Palecz, and others, he was attached by warm affection for the national interests. His profound piety and his talent as a preacher found their recognition in the fact that, though he had received priests' orders only in the year 1400, he obtained as early as two years after this the office of preacher at the Bethlehem Chapel, as rector of which he was required in the

[1] *Doc.*, 74.

[2] The documentary evidences for this are given by Berger, *Hus*, 38, 39.

terms of the foundation to proclaim the Word of God in the Czechist language on all Sundays and holy days.[1] This Bethlehem, the scene of his triumphs, became to him in reality a home, to which he was ever ardently attached. Even as a student he was made acquainted, it is true, with the philosophical views of Wiclif. That he availed himself of Wiclif's treatises of this tenour as early as 1398 may be held as proved in the present day; but Wiclif's influence was of importance for him only when he caught sight of the first theological tractates of the Reformer.[2] From this moment he first entered upon that line of action in which he attained to his true significance. Until then filled to the depth of his soul with reverence for the Church's rites and its means of grace, he now began his zealous opposition to the same.

Between the universities of Prague and Oxford there existed connecting links from early times. A law of the philosophic faculty of 20th April, 1367, determined that the bachelors in their lectures should make use of the note-books of well-known masters belonging to the universities of Prague, Paris, or Oxford: only doctors and masters were permitted

[1] With many historians of earlier and more recent date is found the erroneous assertion that there were till then no churches in Prague where the people could hear preaching in the Czech mother-tongue. To that which has been cited by Berger, *Johannes Hus und König Sigismund*, 71, we have to add the classic passage of Ludolph of Sagan, a contemporary who studied at Prague about 1370, cap. 30: "Et quidem ibi fuit ab olim permixtus populus de utroque ydiomate et ideo rectores ecclesiarum prius predicabant libere in quocunque istorum ydeomatum prout sue plebi viderant expedire."

[2] Lechler, *Johann v. Wiclif*, ii. 135.

to lecture from their own note-books.[1] Thus the magister Adalbert Ranconis boasts in his teaching of having always followed the sacred and distinguished doctors of the renowned universities—those at Paris and Oxford. At both universities, it is probable, Ranconis had studied; he was tutor in Paris, and, as we must infer from an observation he made in reply to Archbishop John of Jenzenstein, in Oxford also, before he began his labours in Prague.[2] That the attendance at the English university on the part of Bohemian students was nothing rare, we see from the testament of Ranconis. The attendance at the English university became more frequent after the sister of Wenzel, Anne of Luxemburg, was married to King Richard II. in 1382. In her service there were to be found many of her countrymen, and even in the service of leading Englishmen were staying people from Bohemia.[3] From this time dates the diffusion of Wiclif's writings in Prague. That we have at least to suppose this during the latter half of the ninth decade of the fourteenth century, is apparent even from the saying of Hus, by way of answer to the Englishman Stokes in 1411: "I, and the members of our university, have possessed and read those books now *for twenty years and more*."[4] And similar is the well-known declaration of King Sigismund, at the time of the Council of Constance:

[1] *MM. univ. Prag.*, i. 41, 50.

[2] *Archiv für österr. Gesch.*, 57, 11, 71. "Te demum in Oxoniensi pariter et Parisiensi studiis nullum tibi errorem impositum ad revocandum astruis," Jenzenstein cries to him.

[3] Höfler, *Anna von Luxemburg*, 83, 93. Lindner, *Gesch. des d. Reiches unter Wenzel*, i. 118 ff.

[4] *Opera*, i. 108.

"Truly I was but a youth when this sect arose and spread in Bohemia, and behold to what strength it has already attained."[1] This intercourse must have continued without remission up to the death of the queen, Anne, in 1394; even afterwards it was not entirely interrupted.[2]

As regards the question by whom Wiclif's writings were brought into Bohemia, various answers were returned as early as the middle of the fifteenth century. It is significant that a man who lived in the midst of that age, and regarded with searching glance the movement in Bohemia from its earliest beginnings—the Silesian, Ludolph of Sagan—declares that he knows not who brought the heretical writings of the Englishman to Prague.[3] A member of his cloister was able a half century later to relate that the Bohemians, desirous of being able to cope with the Germans in theological lore, sent to Oxford two of their countrymen, who were distinguished above others by particular talents; namely, the Master John Hus and Jerome of Prague. There the two men formed an acquaintance with Wiclif's writings.[4] That there is not a spark of truth in this piece of information is easily shown: Hus was never in Oxford, and Jerome was not sent there by the people of Prague, far less with the alleged intent.

But equally inaccurate is the statement of Enea Silvio, that a man of an illustrious house, Faulfisch

[1] *Documenta mag. Joann. Hus*, 315.
[2] Lechler, *Wiclif*, ii. 113.
[3] Ludolph of Sagan, "Tractatus de longevo schismate," cap. 27 (in my edition, p. 425).
[4] *Catalog. abb. Sag., SS. rer. Sil.*, ii. 283.

by name, brought over with him the first copies of Wiclif's writings to Prague.[1] There is notably a confounding with that Nicholas Faulfisch, who, in company with another student, brought to Prague a document, wherein the University of Oxford, on the 5th October, 1406, pronounced for the orthodoxy of Wiclif.

The prebendary Nicholas Tempelfeld of Brieg, one of the most passionate opponents of King George of Podiebrad, speaks of the doctrines of Wiclif as brought into Bohemia by certain Englishmen, whose names he does not mention.[2] He has manifestly in view the magister Peter Payne, who from 1410 to 1415 occupied the dignity of Vice-principal of St. Edmund's Hall in Oxford, and afterwards went to Bohemia, where he took the liveliest interest in religious questions. He was to the end of his life a zealous Wiclifite, and died only in the year 1455—three years before Tempelfeld composed his tractate.

Just as little credence is due to the report of Stanislas of Welwar, who appears in the year 1455 as dean of the faculty of artists in Prague, and was afterwards made canon of Prague. A discourse of his is still extant,[3] in which he relates that a bachelor

[1] *Hist. Boh.*, 35. Enea's account of the matter passed into most of the later books of history, since his history of Bohemia was greatly read. Comp. Meisterlin's *Chronik von Nürnberg*, Chroniken der d. Städte, iii., 171—3.

[2] See my paper on Tempelfeld in the *Arch. für öst. Gesch.*, 61, 135.

[3] "Oracio reverendi magistri Stanislai de Welwar canonici Pragensis ecclesie," in *Cod. univ. Prag.* xi. C. 8, 280, 281; printed in the *Geschichtschreiber der husit. Beweg.*, iii., 179; comp. Palacky, *Die Geschichte des Husitenthums*, 116.

of the University of Prague was sent to Oxford to ascertain whether it was a fact that Wiclif had been condemned by the Archbishop of Canterbury and many bishops. The bachelor obtained possession of a certificate of the University of Oxford, erased the writing down as far as the seal, and then wrote upon the parchment a commendation of Wiclif's writings. Coming to his death-bed he repented of the act, and spoke of it in the presence of Sigismund of Gistebnitz, saying that he had never in his life committed a worse offence than this. It will be seen that we have here only to do with another redaction of the story of Nicholas Faulfisch, fabricated for a specific end.

The report of Stanislas of Welwar is met with again in the chronicles of the notary Prokop—once more not without important modifications.[1] Here, too, Hus and Jacobell were deceived. Some, says Prokop, carried into Bohemia the books of John Wiclif, who had been condemned by the Church, and falsified a document by inserting the name of John Wiclif in place of the name of a master who was declared in this document to be Catholic. Here, likewise, the deceiver experiences remorse upon his death-bed, and pronounces this fraud the worst crime of his life.

Cochlæus combined the version of Enea Silvio with that of Nicholas Tempelfeld, and speaks also of Peter Payne as the person who transplanted

[1] The text is corrupted in the edition. In *Geschichtschr. der hus. Beweg.*, i. 68, instead of "nomine, quod magistri cuiusdam in eadem litera confirmatum," we have to read, "nomen magistri cuiusdam, quod in eadem litera confirmatum."

Wiclif's books into Bohemia.[1] With later historians, particularly from the time of Hajek, fresh details are found; and so even in our own day the narration has been given of a certain Jerome Faulfisch, to whom the propaganda on behalf of Wiclif is traced back.

For the rest we are here concerned with the diffusion of Wiclif's *theological* writings in Bohemia, since his philosophical works were not in a position to call forth any ecclesiastical movements of importance. How closely, however, Hus studied the philosophical writings also of this Englishman is apparent from the fact that long passages from Wiclif's books, *e.g.*, from the treatise *de universalibus*, are reproduced in Hus' works. There are still lying in the Royal Library at Stockholm five tractates of a philosophic character written by the hand of Hus, and completed in the year 1398. By whom these philosophic writings were first introduced into Bohemia can no longer be determined. On the other hand, theological writings were brought out of England by the well-known JEROME of Prague. Jerome can hardly have been abroad before the year 1399,[2] since he only became licentiate in 1398, and in the following year obtained the *dispensatio biennii*, which freed him from the obligation of rendering service as a schoolmaster. At the Council of Constance he stated that he had repaired to England in his youthful days, out of a desire for learning; and because he heard that Wiclif was a man of deep

[1] *Historia Hussitarum*, 8.

[2] On this point see Palacky, *Geschichte des Husitenthums*, 113.

learning and distinguished ability, he had written out Wiclif's Dialogue and Trialogue—of which he had been able to obtain MSS.—and had brought them to Prague. This might be in the year 1401 or 1402; for in the year 1403 was issued the condemnation of the so-called Forty-five Articles of Wiclif. Stitny's work on "Christian Instruction," which in its last redaction was prepared only in 1400, already manifests an acquaintance with Wiclif's doctrine of the Supper. "Behold," says Stitny, "I am already in my seventieth year, and yet some masters have unsettled my judgment; so that I cannot say with certainty whether in the sacrament the bread is still present, under which would also be the body of the Lord, or whether the bread already ceases to be.

"I was of the latter opinion, in the belief that the Church had so decided, and this opinion I set forth in some of my books. Those masters, however, showed me plainly that the bread is present in the sacrament, and the body of the Lord also. Nevertheless, I had rather say, 'I know not what is true,' than say, 'This or that is true,' when the Church has not yet decided with regard to it."[1] We conclude, too, from Stitny's words, that the doctrine of the Supper was at an early period the subject of lively discussion in conversation and writing, as also that this doctrine soon found a reception beyond the narrow circles of Prague. Hus himself, in an answer before the Council of

[1] Wenzig, *Studien über den Ritter Thomas von Stitny*, 20. By Tomek, *Dejepis mesta Prahy*, 444, Stitny's acquaintance with the writings of Wiclif is placed as early as 1395.

Constance on the 7th June, 1415, acknowledged that "twelve years ago," before Wiclif's theological writings were known in Bohemia, he was fond of reading the philosophical works of this writer. This consequently leads also to the year 1402 or 1403.

However much accounts may differ as to the question who it was that first brought the theological books of Wiclif into Bohemia, *that* it was the books of the English doctor whereby the movement was kindled, which laid such deep hold upon the people, of this no doubt has existed either in the minds of Hus' contemporaries or of later authors. This movement, as we learn from Stitny's words, henceforth conducted the thoughts into a new channel. What Stitny had believed before is all at once deemed no longer tenable; he himself, however, who had grown up with the old order of things, hesitates about attaching himself to the new.

As late as the year 1392, Hus, too, as has been already observed, sacrificed his last four groschen. "And then," says the University Chronicle, "was the magister John Hus"—he was not yet priest at the time—"frivolously deceived by such sermons, and confessed at the Wischehrad, handing the father confessor the last four groschen which he possessed, so that there remained only dry bread for his support."[1]

As according to the above evidence a direct influencing of Hus by the books of Janow cannot be demonstrated, so in general it was only those circles

[1] *Chron. un. Prag. ad ann.* 1392.

intimately connected with Bethlehem which determined the course of Hus during his first period. That he was then still filled with a deep reverence for the existing Church and its ordinances may be taken as proved.

It was the works of Wiclif which first called forth that deep religious movement in Bohemia. That this was nothing else than pure Wiclifism, we know from original documents and historic notices of this period and of the times immediately following. Thus it is said in Ludolph of Sagan, the contemporary of Hus, that "the terrible deeds, repugnant to the faith, to truth and equity, justice, religion, and Church, took their start from the books of Wiclif."[1]

In like manner speaks Andrew of Brod, long the vigorous fellow-labourer of Hus,—on a domain, it is true, somewhat remote from that of religion,—when he says: "Ye may speak as ye list on the grievous irregularities of the clergy; only be silent about the errors and books of Wiclif, of which ye are the protectors. I, poor child of man, say to you: If not for other things, merely because ye preach against the clergy, no one will put you under the excommunication; for even from ancient times have Konrad (of Waldhausen), Milicz, Stekna, and very many others, preached against the clergy, without any of them being placed under an interdict."[2]

[1] "Gesta namque horribilia . . . utcunque descripta de libris Wiclif."

[2] "Dicitis de criminibus clericorum, sed de erroribus et libris Wiclef, quos protegitis, nullam mencionem facitis. Ego pauper homuncio dico, si non alia, propter hoc, quod predicatis contra clericos, nullus vos ut estimo excommunicaret. Nam et ab antiquis temporibus Milicius, Conradus, Stekna et

By reason of the books of Wiclif, it is said, in the *University Chronicle*, arose the memorable dissension among the clergy.[1]

The real character of the Hussite movement in the two first decades of its existence may still be recognised with considerable distinctness from the writings of its most unsparing opponent, the Carthusian prior, Stephen of Dolein, near Olmütz. He holds responsible for the same no other than the magister Wiclif, whom he apostrophises with great animation in a tractate composed in the year 1408. The tractate bears at the heading the characteristic title *Antiwiclif*. Hus' name is not mentioned in this tractate. On the other hand, in those which follow, *Antihussus*, composed in 1412, the *Dialogus Volatilis*, written in September 1414, and the *Epistle to the Hussites*, written in 1417, he launches out with all vigour against Hus, but still more against Wiclif, as Hus' teacher. This man, he says, has infected Hus and Jerome, and the others ;[2] calls Hus, after a well-known model, the only-begotten son of Wiclif, in whom he has his good pleasure (charissimus).[3] Stephen designates himself as the dog which has incessantly barked, but not to the end that the Hussites might proceed from Wiclif. Hus is looked upon by him as the most eminent panegyrist and

alii quam plurimi contra clericos predicaverunt, nullus tamen propter hoc excommunicacionis fuit sentencie subiectus." *Docum.*, 520.

[1] "Item, A.D. 1403 incepit notabilis dissensio in clero propter quosdam articulos ex Johannis Wiclef doctoris Anglici libris non bene extractos."

[2] Pez., *Thes. anecd.*, iv. 596.

[3] *Ibid.*, 573.

disciple of Wiclif,[1] as his advocate;[2] Wiclif himself, as the Arius of his time.[3] He reprimands the Hussites, who in their arrogance strut about,—these scholars of Wiclif. The Bethlehem chapel is for him a cave which forms their hiding-place;[4] there conventicles are held, and there is the Satanic school of Wiclif. In this strain he goes on with numerous variations of language. Stephen has to object to the reading of Wiclif's books, that it corrupts the ill-educated people; if people would only read them in order to find that which is good in them, and to reject the evil in them with abhorrence![5] His last tractate, moreover, already combats the communion *sub utraque*. But in the last words he further reproaches his opponents with being ashamed of the designation Wiclifites and Hussites, whereas they surely are obedient in the highest degree to the teachings of Wiclif and Hus. Not far otherwise does Stephen of Palecz speak.[6]

An old annalistic register says, at the year 1409, that then *Wiclify* began to wax strong;[7] and Kunz of Zwola laments, "The Bohemians have become heretics, because they adhere to the arch-heretic, John Wiclif."

Who it was that "opened the eyes" of the magis-

[1] Pez, *Thes. anecd.*, iv. 526, 527.
[2] *Ibid.*, 458.
[3] *Ibid.*, 437.
[4] *Ibid.*, 374.
[5] *Ibid.*, 572, and so repeatedly: "In partem Wiclef dilapsi . . . . vester magister Wiclef et filii tui sequaces . . . . quare Wicleph adheretis . . . . Wiclef vester deus . . . . vestrum caput," etc.
[6] In a writing as yet unprinted.
[7] *Geschichschr. der husit. Bewegung*, ii. 73.

ter John Hus was still known full well among the societies of the Taborites, decades after his death. It was in the year 1430 that the Taborite priesthood were compelled to come forward with all their influence in defence of Wiclif; for the magister John Pribram had asserted of the books of Wiclif that they contained erroneous and heretical sentiments.[1] And yet these, was their reply, are books which Master John Hus, in union with other masters, victoriously defended at the University of Prague, and in manifold wise commended. The Taborite priesthood, in order to meet this procedure, issued their own ordinances, in accordance with which the clergy in the Taborite towns were to comport themselves. And among the four points which were settled in reference to this matter at Tabor on the 13th of January, 1430, the controversy respecting the sacrament of the altar still—as in the year 1403—plays an important part.

Yet more explicit information do we obtain from another passage. "It was these books of the evangelical doctor and master, John Wiclif, which, as is known from credible witnesses, opened the eyes of Master John Hus of blessed memory, whilst he was reading and re-reading the same in association with his adherents." The so-called Chronicle of the

[1] "Quia nuper in hoc regno Bohemiæ insurrexit quidam veritatis æmulus, divisionis et dissensionis seminator, nomine mag. Johannes Pribram, hæreticans et erroneans libros doctoris ewangelici magistri Johannis sc. Wikleph, quos magister Johannes Hus sanctæ memoriæ cum aliis magistris in universitate studii Pragensis contra doctores, magistros, et prælatos, invincibiliter defendens, multipliciter commendavit." Palacky, *Urk. Beiträge*, ii. 88.

Taborites errs only in supposing the eyes of Hus were first opened in the year 1410: we find, on the contrary, views of Wiclif's, nay, whole passages and argumentations from Wiclif's works, in Hus' writings composed prior to this year.[1]

In an academical address which has been rightly ascribed to Hus, and which he delivered in the year 1409,[2] he breaks forth into lively complaints that the Bohemian people are now unjustly decried as heretics —that sacred Bohemian nation of whom, to be sure, the old proverb says, "No real Bohemian can be a heretic." "Believe them not," he exclaims, "who mendaciously assail the good name of the kingdom, and of the sacred city of Prague." Hus complains that so many ignoramuses of the clerical order prate in their discourses before all the people: "'Here in the city are countless heretics, folk call them Wiclifists.' As for myself, I confess before you here, that I have read and studied the works of the magister John Wiclif, and I readily acknowledge that I have learnt from them much that is good. Truly not everything which I have found in this or the other doctor is on that account of the same weight with me as the Gospel; for only to Holy Scripture will I maintain this reverential obedience. Why, then, should we not read Wiclif's books also, in which are written down countless sacred truths?" In conclusion he

[1] "Qui libri magistro Johanni Hus divæ memoriæ ut noscunt plures fide digni, *quod sic asseruit*, aperuerunt oculos, dum eos volvebat et revolvebat." *Geschichtschr. der hus. Beweg.*, ii. 593.

[2] "Recommendatio artium liberalium," in Höfler, *FF. rer. Aust.*, vi. 112-128.

calls upon the students present diligently to peruse the books of Wiclif. If, however, some things should be contained therein, which on account of their youthful age they cannot, perhaps, as yet understand, let them keep the same for after times. He pours out his scorn upon a preacher[1] who did not preach, but shriek to the people about the Apocalypse, and, talking of the tail of the dragon, made the assertion that this dragon was the magister John Wiclif, who has already involved in his error more than a third part of the Militant Church.

Similar declarations of his belief are frequently found in the writings of Hus.[2] They are met with also just as often in the case of his friends. In this sense Pribram, too, expresses himself: "It is not I who have begun to diffuse the errors of Wiclif, but the whole Bohemian nation, with the magister John Hus and Jacobell."

Under these circumstances it will be explicable that in contemporary letters, documents, annalistic registers, and in numerous street songs, mention is made almost exclusively of *Wiclifites* (Wiclefites, Wiclefists, etc.), and the designation *Husse* (Hussites,

[1] "Nonne a plerisque noscuntur hic idiotae presbyteri, honore scienciarum a nemine sublimati in sermonibus vulgaribus coram plebe mendaciter garulasse: hic in civitate quam plures esse hereticos, quos Wyclefistas appellant, et ego quantum ad me attinet, coram vobis profiteor, me libros magistri Johannis Wycleph legisse et studuisse sicut et aliorum doctorum libros et in eis profiteor multa bona didicisse."

[2] Comp. Hus, Sermons, *l. c.*, ii. 45: "And if any one says that they are nevertheless able to bring forward Holy Scripture in support of their dogmas, these men at once cry out: 'Just look at the *Wiclifite*, who will not listen to the Holy Church.' For they look upon themselves and their unscriptural ordinances as the Holy Church."

etc.) is of comparatively late occurrence, and then, almost without exception, in combination with *Wiclifite*. Thus, for instance, in the *Documenta magistri Johannis Hus*, edited by Palacky, we meet with the appellation *Wiclifite* in twenty-three letters and documents;[1] while the appellation *Hussite* occurs only once, namely, in the (later added) superscription to some State papers, and then four times in combination with the expression Wiclifite. The latter expression may be regarded as, strictly speaking, indicative of the adherents of the new doctrine, as further appears from an official paper of King Sigis-

[1] In the year 1408 we find them termed *Wiclifite* in the complaint of the Prague clergy to the archbishop. *Vid.* Palacky, *Documenta*, 153; in the Synodal Statutes (*ib.* 333); in the Chronicon. univ. Prag. (*ib.* 735); and in an annalistic register (*Doc.* 736); the year 1412 in the complaint of the Prague clergy at the papal court, that erroneous dogmas were derived from Wiclif's books, and thence diffused (*Doc.* 458); the year 1413 as an expression of Palecz in a letter of Hus (*Doc.* 56), in the reply of the Prague masters to the conditions made by the theological faculty for the restoration of unity (*Doc.* 501). The whole party of Hus is designated as the Wiclifistic in what may be termed an official paper addressed to the theological faculty (*Doc.* 508); Stanilas of Znaim, Stephen of Palecz, and Andrew of Brod (the latter, *Doc.* 519), speak only of Wiclefists. At the Council of Constance the adherents of Hus were designated by particular individuals (*Doc.* 541, 542, 601), and by the council as such (*vide Doc.* 474, 578, 648, 649), as Wiclifites; thus also Hus' contemporary and zealous opponent at the Council of Constance, John, the Man of Iron, Bishop of Leitomischl, speaks of the sect of the Wiclefists (*Doc.* 259), of Wiclefists, who have sown the tares in Bohemia. In the year 1416 it is complained in the "Accusationes regis Wenceslai, reginæ Sophiæ, nobilumque Bohemorum," which were laid before the Council of Constance, that Wiclefists were to blame for the ruin of the university, etc. King Sigismund likewise speaks of Wiclifites in an epistle to the council: "Qui dicuntur de secta Wiclefistarum." We might incline to the belief that he only makes a pretext of the

mund, of the 11th July, 1418, addressed to the Elector Lewis of the Palatinate;[1] and thus also later, at the beginning of the Hussite war, we find the designation *Wiclifite* at first the prevailing one. Gradually this recedes before the other, and we hear more and more word of Hussites,[2] of Orphans, Taborites, etc. As regards the annals and chronicles of Bohemia, we find the *Chronicon Bohemie*,[3] the chronicles of the University of Prague,[4] the

combating of the Wiclifites, while in reality desirous of depriving his brother of the kingdom (*Doc.* 654). A cantio of 1418 sings:

"Fidelis Bohemus plangit,
Omnes Wiclefistas tangit;

* * *

Wiclefistæ expellantur."

Andreas de Brod in 1414 makes use of the expression *Joannita*, which is of course equivalent to *Husita* (*vid. Doc.* 519). The latter term is met with before 1416 in combination with Wiclefista (*Doc.* 639, 640, and 736). In a superscription to a state paper of 1416, which may itself be of later date, we read, "Accusatio super sacerdotes Hussitas."

[1] *Reichstagsacten*, vii., 349: "Ut novitatem, que ibidem de Wiclefistis exsurrexit, possimus eradicare."

[2] In the *Urk. Beiträge* for the history of the Hussite war, published by Palacky, there is found (I have supplemented the list to some extent from MSS.):—For the year—

1420	the designation Wiclefite (Wiclefy) 8 times,						Hussite 4 times.	
1421	,,	,,	,,	9	,,	,,	11	,,
1422	,,	,,	,,	6	,,	,,	10	,,
1423	,,	,,	,,	0	,,	,,	4	,,
1424	,,	,,	,,	2	,,	,,	6	,,
1425	,,	,,	,,	1	,,	,,	7	,,
1426	,,	,,	,,	0	,,	,,	5	,,
1427	,,	,,	,,	2	,,	,,	18	,,
1428	,,	,,	,,	0	,,	,,	9 (7)	,,
1429	,,	,,	,,	0	,,	,,	27	,,
1430	,,	,,	,,	0 (1)	,,	,,	51	,,

[3] *Geschichtschr. der hus. Beweg.*, i., 11: "Citatus est archiepiscopus a Wiclefistis."

[4] *Ibid.*, 18, 19, 22, 24, 33, 35, 36, 43.

Chronicon Trebonicnse,[1] the chronicle of the notary Prokop,[2] employing the designation Wiclefists when they speak of the adherents of Hus. Only here and there do we find in Prokop, who for the rest was no contemporary with the movement at its inception, the designation Hussitæ. The latter expression is unknown to the *Chronicon veteris collegiati*, and Lawrence of Brezowa speaks either of Wiclefists, or, to be more distinct, says Wiclefites, otherwise known as Hussites.[3] The anonymous writer, *de origine Taboritarum*, speaks likewise only of Wiclefists;[4] as in like manner this expression is found in many other contemporary annalistic records, or in the satirical songs of Bohemia. In the neighbouring lands of Moravia, Silesia, Lusatia, the name *Hussita* earlier established itself. Stephen of Dolein[5] already speaks much of the Husonistæ, as does also Ludolph of Sagan;[6] yet with each of them the expression Wiclefists is of more frequent occurrence. During the years 1420-30 the designation Hussita comes into more general use. "Wiclefites" appears hence-

[1] *Geschichtschr. der hus. Beweg.*, i, 50, 65.

[2] *Ibid.*, 59—76.

[3] *Ibid.*, 324: "Presbyteri magistro Johanni Hus adherentes protunc Wiclefiste . . . . 328: Wiclefiste seu Hussite."

[4] *Ibid.*, 528: "Hec videntes Wiclefiste cogitare ceperunt . . . . que Wiclefiste in sua detinent potestate."

[5] Pez, *Thesaurus anecdotorum*, iv., 2, and elsewhere.

[6] "Quod quidam . . . . sequaces doctrinam Joh. Wyclyff" (155). Wiclefiste et Hussite (*ib.* 130), Wiclefiste (155, 187), and elsewhere. In Melk, too, either Wiclefiste is written, or Hussite is further added. After the great campaigns the term Wiclifite occurs only in isolated cases; comp. Andrew of Ratisbon, *Chron. Bav.*, ed. Schilter, 45 ff., Tempelfeld, *l.c.*, Gobelin, and others. With regard to Chelcicky, comp. Supplement.

forth only in documents proceeding from the papal chancery, and even in these the supplementary epithet "Hussites" is added to that term. The old designation, however, does not altogether disappear. In the notes which have been preserved of the disputation between Catholics and Hussites at the Castle of Zebrak in the year 1428, and which proceed from the pen of John of Duba, the opponents are still designated "Wiclefites" by the Catholics.[1] And so also, in the middle of the fifteenth century, Tempelfeld and others still speak of them as Wiclefites.

The truth concerning the relation of Hus to Wiclif, as is evident from the first, was spoken by the Englishman Stokes: Hus need not boast of these writings and doctrines as his own, since, after all, they belong to Wiclif, in whose paths he walks.[2]

Yet Stokes assuredly went too far when he expressed the opinion that Hus was boasting of these dogmas "*as his own.*" That he did so is not to be discovered from the writings of Hus, either from his dissertations, or from his sermons and letters.

As thus we see Hus from the year 1403 engaged in the diligent study of Wiclif's books, and accordingly find Wiclif's articles of doctrine present in considerable number, even in those tractates and sermons which he wrote and preached in the time

[1] *Archiv cesky*, iii. 264; Palacky, *Urk. Beiträge*, i. 545.

[2] "Et Stokes Anglicus dixit ad magistrum: Et quid tu gloriaris in his scriptis et doctrinis, tibi eorum titulum vane ascribendo, cum hae doctrinæ et sententiæ non sunt tuæ, sed pocius Wiclef, cuius viam sequeris." Petri de Mladenovic relacio in *Doc. mag. Joannis Hus*, 308.

of his agreement with the ecclesiastical heads of his charge; so also this whole movement of spirits, taking its rise from the year 1403, appeared to contemporaries[1] as Wiclifism incarnate, and consequently it is no wonder if Hus himself is designated by contemporaries as a Wiclifite, as is actually the case, *e.g.*, in the accusation of the Bohemian clergy of the year 1412.[2]

[1] As has been already shown by Lechler, *Johann von Wiclif*, 169; but he has fixed the epoch too late. Wiclifism appears even from the year 1403 as the hinge of the whole movement. Of this sufficient evidence is furnished by Stephen, the Carthusian prior of Dolein: *Medulla tritici.*

[2] *Docum.*, 460. *Geschichtschr. der hus. Bewegung*, ii. 204.

CHAPTER V.

WICLIFITE CURRENTS AND COUNTER-CURRENTS DURING THE YEARS 1403—1409.

NO other Bohemian king, not even the "ufgeruckte" (intruder) Hussite king "Jirsik," was held in such ill repute with the Germans and Catholic inhabitants of the lands bordering on Bohemia as Wenzel, and upon none has posterity pronounced a severer judgment.[1] He was the "desolator" of the general study.[2] Heresy he favoured, if he did not hatch it; and this was with the Germans so much the more odious, inasmuch as it displayed a rooted opposition to all that was German. No wonder that he was accused of a whole series of infamous deeds, such as only a busy imagination could invent.[3]

---

[1] See the characteristic features of Wenzel as sketched by Lindner, *Gesch. des deutschen Reiches unter K. Wenzel*, ii. 170, and the *Excursus*, 469—472.

[2] Wenzel von Iglau, *Mitth. des Vereins f. Gesch. d. D. in Böhmen*, xix. 86.

[3] The most passionate accusations are met with in Ludolph of Sagan, *l. c.*, 393 ff.; and cap. 17—31, which are occupied exclusively with Wenzel's misdeeds. Complaints against Wenzel as favouring heresy are likewise to be found elsewhere, and were formally handed in at the Council of Constance. See *Documenta*, 638—642.

But critical investigation likewise has led to the conviction that his rule was weak from the first, and towards the close absolutely incapable. The political conflicts in the land, the national strife which broke out in the years 1380-90, the controversy of the King with the higher clergy, the indulgence in favouritism, the founding of the league of the nobles, and its immediate consequences—all this pointed to the headlong descent of the Caroline monarchy; while men were contending in Prague about the theses of Wiclif, Wenzel was lying a captive in Vienna. But there was also lacking at that time a spiritual head, like Arnest of Pardubitz, who would have upheld the ecclesiastical authority in the land with a firm hand. It is now acknowledged as a fact, undisputed even on the strictly Catholic side, that neither Wolfram of Skworec, nor Zbinco of Hasenburg—to whom so important a part was assigned during the first years of the Wiclifite movement in Bohemia—was equal to his high position, to which it must be said the latter attained in comparatively youthful years. Zbinco wielded the sword more readily than the pen; and when—as in the summer of 1404, against Nicholas Zul of Ostredek, or in the year 1406, against the Bavarians—he took the field against the enemies of his royal master, he reminded of the militant princes of the Church in bygone ages, who were much more at home on the field than in the choir. In Bohemia he was, indeed, the last bishop who exchanged the stole for the sword. In his learning he was not very far advanced: those street-ballads have attained a certain celebrity, in which he is satirised as burning

books without knowing what was written in them.[1] From the tenour of these songs the false impression has been received in later times, that the bishop was ignorant of the art of reading.

Under such favourable circumstances, Wiclifism was able to strike deep roots in Bohemia. Nevertheless it did not advance with equal step throughout the land. The contemporary authors distinguish already two phases of its development, and point to the year 1409, the year of the departure of the German students and professors from Prague, as the dividing line between the two. In the year of the Lord 1409—says a chronicle—was the schism in Prague, between the Bohemian students and the other nations, so that the latter and the Germans were driven away from Prague. "*And immediately after*," continues the chronicle, "*Wiclify began to wax strong*, and the magister John Hus and his adherents renounced their spiritual obedience under the favour of the laity."[2]

And so also Stephen of Dolein says, that from about the year 1410 that pestilence which had sprung up from the books of Wiclif, as tares amidst the wheat of Christ, began to attain full growth. For in connection with that indirect expulsion, says Ludolph of Sagan, Bohemians seemed to cling to Bohemians, as did even those who were no abettors of heresy. The skilled among the Bohemians thought, indeed, that without the aid of another nation they would be able alone to

[1] See the Appendix, No. V.
[2] *Geschichtschr. der hus. Bew.*, ii. 73.

root out those noxious weeds, Wiclifists and Husonists.[1]

During the years 1402-1409 the movement did not as yet beat in such mighty waves, although it was already clearly perceptible. The drift of it was influenced not alone by general political considerations, but also, and in particular, by motives of a national and scientific character. With regard to the last-named, the action of the university became typical.

Founded by Charles IV., "in order that the inhabitants of Bohemia, who ceaselessly hunger after the fruits of knowledge, may find the table spread for them in their own land, without being compelled to beg in foreign lands," and designed to be a point of attraction for those in all lands who thirsted for knowledge, it drew to itself, from the first, many Germans—as would seem natural on account of the absence of other universities in Germany, and considering the fact that Prague was the capital of the kingdom. The Germans from the beginning possessed the predominance over the natives, a thing which was so much the more bitterly felt by the latter, inasmuch as not only in convocation, but also in the elections, they had only one voice, whereas the foreigners had three; and the university offices, benefices, and the foundations in the gift of the university, were in the hands of the strangers.[2] In

[1] *Epistola ad Hussitas, in* Pez, *l. c.*, 4-6.

[2] On these national contentions at the university, see Palacky, *Gesch. v. Böhmen*, iii. 1, 232; Held, *Tentamen Prag.*, 1827; as also Höfler, *Der Mag. Joh. Hus;* comp. likewise Paulsen, "Die Gründung der deutschen Universitäten im M.-A.," in the 45th vol. of the *Hist. Zeitschrift*, 258.

opposition to these privileges of the foreigners, such important advantages were gained by the Bohemians in the years 1384 and 1390, after repeated onslaughts, that from 1390 the national opposition ceased for more than a decade. At the close of the fourteenth century Hus rose at the head thereof, and about him ranged themselves a group of men, whose hearts beat passionately for the interests of their nation. How often does Hus speak of his people as the "hallowed" nation, of the "happy" Bohemians, of Prague as "the second Paris." That he ever displayed any animosity towards the Germans, he afterwards emphatically denied; but even in the words he employs in this denial such sentiment is implied. A good German, he said, was for him preferable to a bad Bohemian. It is traceable, moreover, in his tractates and sermons, and is confirmed by perfectly credible contemporaries.[1] Side by side with this strong national current there ran yet another. As Hus' teacher and master belonged to the number of the Realists, so did Hus himself; whereas the three other nations were most pronounced adherents of the Nominalistic school.

These currents and counter-currents must have imparted an entirely unique charm to academic life in Prague during the first years of the fifteenth century. In the halls of the university, the corridors of the churches and monasteries, and even in private houses and in the streets, men discussed in the liveliest manner the great English theologian and

[1] Comp. *Doc. Mag. Joh. Hus*, 34, 168, 177, 181, 184, 187; *Geschichtschr. der hus. Bew.*, i. 70, 176, 179; ii. 73, 156, etc.

philosopher; pretty much as they disputed four hundred years later, in the streets of Jena, about time and space, and the whole system of the great sage of Königsberg.[1]

In Wiclif men commended his pre-eminent scholarship. Of his acute dialectic wonders were told. He could treat disputed questions affirmatively or negatively at pleasure, while no one was able to resist him. This it was not, indeed, which drew Hus so powerfully towards him. "I am drawn to him," he says, in his reply to John Stokes, "by the reputation which he has, and that not with the bad, but with the good priests, with the university of Oxford, and with the people in general—albeit not with the base, avaricious, haughty, and luxurious prelates and priests. I am drawn to him by his writings, by which he seeks to bring back all men to the law of Christ; and specially so with the clergy, to the end that they may dismiss the splendour and glory of the world, and with the Apostles live after the life of Christ. I am drawn by the love which he has for the law of Christ, in that he maintains the truth thereof, namely, that this law cannot in the smallest point be false." As Stephen of Dolein relates, Hus was among the Prague masters at first, "almost the only one who received the writings of Wiclif with pleasure, read them, placed them in the hands of others for study and for a future guiding thread; although there were some people who quietly opposed him, people who now (1417) rest in the Lord, and others who still

[1] *Opera Huss.*, 109 *a*.

remain."[1] That Hus, however, was not alone in his deep veneration for Wiclif, we learn from contemporary sources. In a lampoon of the so-called German mass, it said: Stanislas of Znaim begat Peter of Znaim, Peter of Znaim begat Stephen Palecz, and Stephen Palecz, Hus.[2] Here Stanislas is placed at the head of the whole movement, as in reality he did belong to the Realistic movement, and at first defended Wiclif's doctrine, with greater zeal even than Hus. Therefore Hus could address these men, when they afterwards became his foes, in the words: "Once ye were Realists, now in sooth ye have become Terminists," *i.e.* Nominalists. Besides the persons above mentioned, there were others, as John of Jessenitz, Prokop of Pilsen, Simon of Tisnow, Nicholas of Leitomischl, Christian of Prachatitz, who were distinguished for their hearty participation in the movement brought about by the introduction of Wiclifism. That persons dwelling beyond the limits of Prague associated themselves with the group of Wiclif's disciples resident at the capital, is already evidenced by Thomas of Stitny. The movement spread with surprising rapidity. "I have been astonished," says Stephen of Dolein in his unpleasantly pompous style, "to see how a few senseless magisters, people of Wiclif's school and schism, roused by canine fury, deface the ritual and existing order of the Church by profane and blasphemous sentences, and by articles composed with

[1] *Epistola ad Hussitas, l. c.*, 528.

[2] "Hus ad scripta Stephani Palecz," *Opp.* 255 *b*. Comp. also the last paper of the Appendix.

devilish art, and with impious hardihood shamelessly publish the most worthless fables." That Stephen has already in view the years 1403-1405, in thus writing, is clear from the fact that he attributes the celebrated proclamation of the Prague Archbishop Zbinco of the year 1406, in the affairs of the sacrament of the altar, to the operation of these Wiclifite movements.[1] "After passing through foreign lands," he continues, "now in Bohemia, too, and Moravia, they fill the state apartments of the princes, the colleges and professorial chairs of the priests, the schools of the students, and the crowds of the believing people, with violent terror; nay, they penetrate even into the lonely chambers of the monks, and into the very cells of the Carthusians, which are devoted to repose." Stephen of Dolein himself, in the year 1408, not only displays an intimate acquaintance with Wiclif's *Trialogus*, but even refutes it; whereby a lengthy study thereof is presupposed. And in the *Epistola ad Hussitas* he details how John Hus had translated the *Trialogus*, and had sent it to the Margrave Jodok of blessed memory (obiit 18th January, 1411), as also to other distinguished men, including laity, and even to ladies.[2] And thus we can feel no surprise that Hus, in a sermon he preached at the Synod of the year 1405, made use of Wiclif's words, and that his discourse is penetrated with Wiclif's thoughts.

[1] *Medulla tritici*, 158. The state of the present text there, however, equally as in Palacky, *Doc.* 335, gives occasion for corrections. *For* detruncatos *read* determinatos. The last sentence but one reads: "Unde si quis compertus fuerit . . . hereticus est et ut talis . . . punietur."

[2] Pez, *Thes. anecd., l. c.*, 527.

Nay, even the Wiclifian doctrine of Predestination, which forms the axis of Wiclif's entire system, was brought forward by him in this discourse. The only point open to doubt, is whether this doctrine is taken from the *Trialogus*, or the tractate *De Christo et Adversario suo Antichristo*, or whether it is from Wiclif's work *De Ecclesia*. Probably from the *Trialogus;* for also the defining of the idea of God's love is found there, given in like manner as in the sermon of Hus. The Synodal-sermon, too, of 1407, already contains Wiclifian passages and forms of expression. That Hus was quite familiar with the doctrines of Wiclif as early as the year 1403, is apparent from the fact that his utterances on the doctrine of the Supper, which strongly savour of Wiclif's teaching, are assigned to a very early period.[1]

But already there began to arise protests in important quarters against the growth of Wiclifism. On the 1st of May, 1402, Wolfram of Skworec, Archbishop of Prague, had died. Some weeks before this, 6th March, King Wenzel had been taken captive by his brother Sigismund. In consequence of the disturbances which prevailed in the land, the election of a successor had been postponed. Not until the autumn of 1402 was Nicholas Puchnik, the erewhile companion in suffering of the Vicar-General, John Welflini of Pomuk, elected to the vacant see; but he died at the end of a few weeks, 19th December,

[1] Although the year 1399 is not the true date; since Hus at that time had not been made priest, and the theological writings could not have been known in Prague as early as this.

1402.[1] The archbishopric now remained unfilled until the autumn of 1403. In September 1403 ZBINCO ZAJIC OF HASENBURG was elected. In the meantime two members of the cathedral chapter at Prague—the archiepiscopal official, John Kbel, and the Archdeacon Wenzel of Bechin—in the name of the chapter handed in to the university two series of heretical articles of Wiclif, with a view to getting judgment pronounced upon them. The first series embraced those twenty-four articles condemned by the London Synod in May 1382;[2] then followed a group of twenty-one articles, extracted from Wiclif's writings, by John Hübner, a Silesian, at that time master in Prague. On the 28th of May all the masters assembled in the Carolinum. Hus and Nicholas of Leitomischl accused Hübner of having incorrectly drawn out the articles, and Hus added the words, "Such falsifiers of books better deserve to be burnt than the two adulterators of saffron, Berlin and Wlaska" (who had suffered this punishment about the time). Stanislas of Znaim defended all the articles in a tone so offensive that several doctors quitted the sitting.[3] The decision was carried by a majority,[4] that for the future no one should preach or teach on the forty-five articles.

Most vigorously was Wiclif's doctrine of the

[1] Frind, *Kirchensgeschichte von Böhmen*, iii. 49.

[2] *Concilia Prag.*, 43-46; Palacky, *Doc. mag. Hus*, 327-331; and *Fasc. Zizaniorum*, ed. Shirley, 277. In accordance with the last mentioned, the text in Höfler and Palacky is to be amended. In No. 18, *instead of* collatorum we have to read curatorum. No. 5, *instead of* fundamentum *read* est fundatum.

[3] *Doc. mag. Hus*, 179; *Hus. Opera*, 178.

[4] "Secundum pluralitatem vocum."

Supper assailed and defended. That Stanislas of Znaim was still at that time a mouthpiece of the Wiclifites is evident from the fact, amongst others, that shortly afterwards he himself composed a tractate, *De Remanentia Panis*, on the Wiclifian side. For such controversies on the Supper the soil of Prague was well adapted; as will be supposed after what has been already said on the debate concerning the frequent or daily observance of communion.

Regarding Stanislas of Znaim, Hus tells us that he proclaimed the Wiclifian doctrine of the Supper in the schools, and summoned Hus himself to hold firmly to this doctrine.[1] His tractate on the remanence was pronounced heretical by the magister Ludolph Meistermann, a Saxon[2]—the same who played an important part in the year 1409. Stanislas was compelled to retract his writing; or, as Hus expresses himself in a letter to the magister Christian of Prachatitz, simply to disown it. "Beginning with the days of the assembly in the Carolinum, where he was at first prepared for the defence of the forty-five articles, that they might not be declared heretical, up to the moment when he was forced to recant, and was ill entreated by the Curia,"[3] Stanislas was a zealous Wiclifite; and since we find Stephen of Palecz always on his side, even when it was a question of "erroneous" articles of Wiclif, it is

[1] "Hus ad scripta Stanislai," *Opera*, 288 *a*: "Hæc sunt verba doctoris, quæ dogmatizavit in scholis publicis et reliquit in scripto." *Doc.* 56: "A me quæsivit, antequam disturbium incepit, si vellem idem secum tenere."

[2] Hus calls him Rudolph (vid. *Opera*, 255 *a*); but comp. on the other hand Tempelfeld, *l. c.*, 136. He is there spoken of as "notabilis homo."

[3] Hus, *Opera*, 288 *a*.

likely that Stephen also maintained for a time Wiclif's doctrine of the remanence of the bread after the transformation.[1] As regards Hus himself, some of his adversaries have expressed the opinion that he publicly expounded this doctrine in sermons and on other occasions. These assertions, however, Hus most strenuously denied.[2] The doctrine of Wiclif himself seems, for the rest, to have been modified to some extent in Prague ; at least Ludolph of Sagan breathes a hint of such modification. On this supposition the contradiction between the assertions of Hus and the statements of his accusers would be in some measure explicable.

As opposed to the assertion that the magister Hübner extracted the twenty-one articles incorrectly, mendaciously, and malignantly, and according to Hus' own words was a falsifier of books ; it must nevertheless be observed, that among these articles there is no single one which would not be found to contain Wiclif's thoughts.

The interdiction of the teaching of these forty-five articles in the lecture-rooms of the university, or the preaching in accordance therewith in the pulpits of the churches in Prague, had only an outward effect—and even in this relation its effect was but passing. This inhibition formed only the actual starting-point of a contest, which even within a few years surged in mighty waves. Rightly says the *University Chronicle :* "Item in the year of the Lord 1403

[1] "Ac multos eorum articulorum magister Stanislaus et magister Palecz antea tenuerunt et defenderunt, priusquam in metum secularem inciderunt."

[2] *Doc. mag. Joann. Hus*, 179, 182-184.

arose the memorable dissension in the clergy of the kingdom of Bohemia, among the magisters, priests, and prelates, about certain articles which were not well extracted from the writings of the English doctor, Johannes Wicleff."

During the first years of his archiepiscopal office, Zbinco of Hasenburg reposed full confidence in the magister Hus. He begged Hus, who soon moreover obtained a confidential position at the court, so soon as he should discover any defect, or any abuse, in ecclesiastical affairs, to bring the case within his cognisance personally, or in the event of the archbishop's absence, by letter.[1] In the year 1405 he appears as synodal preacher, along with Stanislas of Znaim.[2] Even in his discourse held before the Synod, the influence of Wiclif strongly asserts itself; and the same may likewise be said with regard to the three other discourses, which are all that is preserved to us of his synodal sermons. But this very Synod of 1405 felt called upon to oppose the spread of Wiclif's doctrine of the Supper; and it would seem that this procedure was not without its influence upon Hus; for all the accusations of being an adherent of this doctrine, brought against him by his adversaries, have reference, as already observed, to utterances alleged to have been made by him at an earlier time. Shortly after the meeting of this synod, Wiclif's authority with his adherents

---

[1] "In principio vestri regiminis." *Doc. mag. Hus*, 3.

[2] *Opera*, ii., 27 *b*; comp. *Cod. un. Prag.*, viii. F. 2, "Sermo synodalis mag. Stanislai de Znoyma, estate 1405." The Synodal Statutes of this year in the *Concil. Prag.*, 46-51.

in Prague was destined to receive considerable augmentation. In the year 1407 or 1408, two Bohemian students brought with them into Prague a testimony of the University of Oxford to the orthodoxy of Wiclif. This testimony was later made a subject of deliberations at the Council of Constance. "Afterwards"—so it is related by Mladenowitz—"the Englishmen presented the copy of a letter of the University of Oxford, concerning which they asserted that the magister Johannes had publicly read it in a sermon, and shown the seal to the people, in recommendation of Wiclif. And when they had read it, they asked him whether he had published its contents. And he answered that the matter stood thus: Two students had brought over this testimony, bearing the seal of the University of Oxford, to Prague. At this stage the Englishmen called upon him to name the students; for the letter, said they, had been forged, and not obtained in a legitimate way. And the magister said, pointing to Palecz: 'This my friend knows quite well, that Nicholas Faulfisch of honest memory, in company with another, as to whom I know not who he was, brought over this letter.'"[1] To this testimony Hus accordingly appealed in his public discourses; and

[1] Mladenowitz in *Doc. mag. Joann. Hus*, 313. This Nicholas Faulfisch related to Hus an attractive history of that which had occurred in England, which Hus with much pleasure imparted to his audience; comp. Hus, *Sermons*, ii. 47. The other student, whose name at that time Hus could no longer recal, was George of Knyehnicz. The Vienna MS. 1294 has, fol. 119, col. 2, the note: "correctus graviter (*not* gnaviter) anno domini 1407, in vigilia Purificationis s. Mariæ *Oxonii* per Nicolaum *Faulfiss* et Georgium de *Knyehnicz*."

even in his reply to the Englishman John Stokes,[1] who made the assertion that Wiclif was counted a heretic in England, Hus says: This seems verily not to be correct; for we have the testimony of the University of Oxford, to which people will surely give greater credence than to him. This testimony already passed for a forgery at the Council of Constance. In our own day, the attempt has been made, on the basis of the account given by a later chronicler, to explain the genesis of the forgery; against which, it is true, an important voice has quite recently pronounced, and has championed the genuineness of the document.[2] Be this as it may, one thing is quite certain, that this letter must necessarily have afforded a powerful impetus to the wider diffusion of Wiclif's doctrine. Hus himself seems to have been deeply moved thereby. He is said to have given utterance to the wish that his soul might come where that of Wiclif is.[3]

The good understanding between Hus and the archbishop comes clearly to light, particularly in the affair of Wilsnack. At Wilsnack, near Wittenberge, was to be found a relic of the blood of Christ, to which an extraordinary power of miracle-working was ascribed. People flocked in from far and near, even from Hungary and Transylvania, and carried home marvellous accounts to their native land. Nevertheless, distrustful voices were raised against it, and Zbinco appointed a commission, on which Hus served, to investigate the state of affairs. Gross frauds were now brought to light, of which

[1] *Opera*, i., 109 *b*. [2] Lechler, *l. c.*, ii. 71. [3] *Docum.*, 154.

Hus gives an account in his treatise "De omni sanguine Christi glorificato."[1] This dissertation, as others, bears distinct traces of Wiclif's influence; as in general it displays a close affinity in its tendency with a second tractate of Hus, "Contra imaginum adoracionem."[2] The latter agrees, in great part with verbal fidelity, with Wiclif's dissertation "De imaginibus." The Synod, likewise, now took proceedings against the disorders at Wilsnack and elsewhere.[3]

As regards the Synodal discourse of Hus in the year 1407, it contains a passage which vividly reminds of the tractate of Kunesch of Trebowel, written by him on behalf of the Bohemian peasantry. Both adduce the same passage of Numb. xxvii., concerning the daughters of Zelophehad, in support of their argumentation.[4]

The good understanding with the archbishop continued until some period in the year 1407. To a certain extent it seems to have been shaken as early as the year 1405. During this year, Innocent VII., at the urgent importunity of the prelates, sent an admonition to Zbinco, inviting him to take more severe measures against the errors and heresies of Wiclif. A consequence of this was the proceeding of the Synod of 1405; the next Synod, which met half a year later, not only renewed the prohibition of Wiclif's doctrine of the Supper, but also warmly declaimed against those preachers who,

[1] *Opera*, i. 158*b*—162*b*.
[2] *Opera*, ii. 340*a*—343*b*.
[3] *Conc. Prag.*, *l.c.*, 47.
[4] *Opera*, ii. 35*b*; comp. my detailed notices in the *Arch. für. öst. Gesch.*, 57, 29, 38, and see above, p. 39, note.

on the ground of Wiclifian propositions, degrade the rank of the clergy.[1] Zbinco issued in the same year an injunction that on Corpus Christi day the unadulterated doctrine of the sacrament should be proclaimed to the faithful Christian people. During these days, as it would seem, Stanislas of Znaim had been compelled to retract his former convictions and views, regarding the remanence of the bread.[2] Under such circumstances it appears remarkable that Hus was not only permitted to preach the Synodal sermons of the years 1406 and 1407, but was moreover commended by Zbinco.[3] Yet there were already to be found in his discourses utterances against the avarice and the disorderly life of the clergy, which aroused strong displeasure. The clergy of the capital and the diocese, therefore, in the year 1408, handed to the archbishop a complaint against Hus, as having calumniated the clergy in his sermons and held them up to the contempt of the people.[4] Hus was now relieved of his post as Synodal preacher. It is probable that he composed at this time his tractate, "De arguendo clero pro concione," in justification of his line of action. In this, too, the influence of Wiclif is to be discerned, though it be to a less extent.[5] The same is evident, likewise, from the legal proceedings against the magister Nicholas

[1] It is certainly open to doubt whether this last injunction is to be placed as early as the year 1406, as is done by Höfler. See the *Chron. Univ. Prag. ad ann.* 1405 and 1406; *Concil. Prag.*, 51, 52; *Doc. mag. Hus*, iii. 32.

[2] The exact date is not to be determined from the materials hitherto published.

[3] *Docum.*, 167.

[4] *Docum.*, 153.

[5] Thus notably the proposition which occurs a hundred

of Welemowitz, called Abraham, and Mathias of Knin, called Pater. Abraham, on whose behalf Hus vigorously interceded with the archbishop, had taught that laymen, too, possessed the right to preach. Mathias of Knin was an adherent of the Wiclifian doctrine of the Supper. At the examination of the former—and we see, also, here, the doctrine of Wiclif in operation—he would neither swear upon the crucifix nor upon the Gospels, but only by God, and Hus defended him before the inquisitors with the words: "St. John Chrysostom speaks of those persons as foolish who demand an oath upon the creature, as though more value were to be attached to this than to swearing by God."[1] Before the matter of Abraham could be brought to a close, the archbishop summoned the Bohemian nation at the university, which assembled on the 20th of May, 1408, and received commission to condemn the forty-five articles. The wish of the archbishop was only partially complied with. The assembly decreed that henceforth no member of the Bohemian nation should be permitted to maintain, teach, or defend one of these forty-five articles in an heretical, erroneous, or offensive acceptation. It was, moreover, determined that for the future no bachelor should hold public lectures on Wiclif's Trialogue, Dialogue, or his Doctrine of the Eucharist, or be suffered to dispute publicly on a proposition of Wiclif's.[2] The

times in Wiclif: "Bona temporalia a clero delinquente auferantur."

[1] *Doc.*, 184*f*; the letter on behalf of Abraham, *ib.* iii. 342. The case of Mathias of Knin, *ib.* 338.

[2] Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, iii. 1, 221.

Synod which was held on the 15th of June of this year renewed the inhibition of Wiclif's doctrine of the Supper, and forbade to the priests all farther injurious observations against the clergy. At the same Synod, Zbinco, at the wish of the king, declared, as the proof resulting from careful investigations, that no Wiclifian heresy was to be found in Bohemia; and in order that none might arise, he commanded that all who were in possession of Wiclif's books should at once surrender the same. This measure remained altogether void of result; for, though perhaps the archbishop was not lacking in good will, he had not the power to carry it into effect, and the Wiclifites ridiculed him and his Bohemian prelates in satirical couplets which were fixed up in sundry public places.[1] To this testimony, given by the archbishop at the summer Synod of the year 1408, King Wenzel attached so much the greater importance, inasmuch as he thought of thereby grasping afresh the reins of government, which had slipped from the hands of his opponent Rupert. The reputation of the Bohemian heresies, and of a favouring of them on the part of the king, could not prove a furtherance to these plans.[2] The reaction against the Wiclifite movement in Bohemia

[1] Of a provincial diet, spoken of by Höfler (*Mag. Joh. Hus*, 193), and after him Frind (*Kirchengeschichte*, iii. 76*f*), the authorities contain no notice. That to which Frind refers (*Concilia Prag*, 61) belongs decidedly to a later time.

[2] Wenzel himself was early involved in this suspicion: "Ut heresis ipsa eciam ad penetralia cubilis sui serperet . . . et conthoralem suam reginam cum multa familia insuper et nonnullas proceres barones et milites maculando corrumperet et corrumpendo macularet." Comp. Ludolph of Sagan, lib. i., cap. 25.

was accordingly in the best train, when an incident occurred which suddenly gave to the matter another and very different complexion. It was the question of neutrality which now came to the front.

In May 1408 the majority of the cardinals had renounced their obedience to both Popes, and were preparing to elect a single supreme head to the Church.[1] From Leghorn they issued the encyclical which summoned a council at Pisa for the 25th March, the day of the Annunciation of Mary. Wenzel, who could look for no advancement of his plans on the part of Gregory XII., withdrew his allegiance from this pontiff, and enjoined upon his prelates absolute neutrality towards both Popes. A like course he looked for from the university. An embassy, consisting of the professors Mauritius Rwacka of Prague, John Cardinalis of Reinstein, Stanislas of Znaim, and Stephen of Palecz, was despatched to the cardinals. Of these the two last-named were arrested in Bologna, at the end of October 1408, by the cardinal legate Balthasar Cossa, and only on the intervention of the cardinals themselves, as subsequently of King Wenzel and the University of Prague, were set at liberty. It has been conjectured, not without reason, that they were placed under arrest on account of their Wiclifian views.[2] Hus attributes it mainly to this imprisonment that Stanislas of Znaim became entirely

[1] "Se subtraxerunt ab adhesione et obediencia utriusque." *Ib.* 15.

[2] Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, iii. 1. 225. The application of the university on behalf of these two, in the *Doc.* 345, No. 9, cf. *ib.* No. 16. The letter of Wenzel to the college of cardinals, de dato Breslau, 24th Nov., *ib.* 343.

estranged from his former companion in the strife.[1] The archbishop, however, remained faithful to Gregory XII., and at the university only the Bohemian nation, of whom Hus was the mouthpiece, declared for neutrality, whereas the other nations were opposed to it—so that a decision could not be obtained. The archbishop issued a reprimand against Hus and the masters who had voted for neutrality, and interdicted to the former the exercise of the preacher's office, which truly did not prevent him further retaining the same.[2] Hus himself saw in these things the beginning of all the accusations and complaints which were afterwards raised against him.[3]

Since Wenzel was now greatly incensed at the proceedings of the three nations on the matter of the neutrality, it seemed to the leaders of the Bohemian nation that the moment was come when they might obtain the decided ascendency in the university. When, therefore, Wenzel had returned from an excursion to Lusatia and Silesia, undertaken during the closing months of 1408, and was now taking up his residence at Kuttenberg, he was importuned by the leaders of the Bohemian nation to alter the existing order of voting, in such wise that for the future in all university matters the three nations should possess but one vote, and the Bohemian nation three. They appealed in favour of this change

[1] "Donec fuit a sancta curia vexatus, et ab illo quem nunc dicit esse caput ecclesie sancte catholice, spoliatus" (*Opera*, 288, cf. *Doc.* 466). Stanislas and Palecz only returned from their travels after the departure of the German students.

[2] *Doc.* 6, 21, 166.

[3] *Ib.* 21: "Ecce accusationis meæ ac gravaminis exordium principale."

to the statutes of the university of Paris. In this conflict Hus was the decided spokesman of the Bohemian nation,[1] and as such he was recognised by his associates. Many a one was ranged on his side, who, like Andrew of Brod, did not share his religious views; others again he was able to hold to the colours by means of intimidation. In the irresolute mood of the king victory was far from certain. And in truth, when the three nations begged of the king the maintenance of their rights, not only did they obtain from him the most encouraging assurance, but also Hus, who afterwards appeared at court at the head of a Bohemian deputation, was so harshly rebuked by the king that he fell into a severe illness through grief. When the controversy about the voices was beginning, Andrew of Brod had said one day with a sigh, "O Hus, is there then *no* deliverer for us in this matter?"[2] and Hus had replied, "I believe we shall find one." At that time he was full of hope. When he was now lying upon his bed of sickness, Brod and Eliæ said, "Oh, if God would only grant it! We shall never attain to it, however." At that very moment a messenger arrived with a royal letter, which abundantly satisfied the boldest wishes of the Bohemian nation. Niklas of Lobkowitz had warmly interceded on their behalf; but in particular the French embassy which was staying at Wenzel's court contrived to influence the decision of the king, in order to draw him entirely to the side of the Pisan cardinals. They represented to him

[1] For that which follows comp. J. Berger, *Johannes Hus und König Sigismund*, 54 *ff*.

[2] "O Hus, non est aliquis nobis in facto isto liberator."

that the French nation too, at the University of Paris, had three voices. When other propositions, put forth on either side,[1] were found to lead to no result, there appeared that decree of the king of the 19th January, 1409, by which the three voices were conceded to the Bohemians. The consequences are well-known. Hus lauded from the pulpit the affection of the king for his people. The Germans, however, had bound themselves with an oath, either to obtain a reversal of the decree or to quit Prague and the land for ever. Their efforts proved unsuccessful. On the 9th May, 1409, a royal mandate was issued, by which the last rector of the old university, Henning Baltenhagen, was deprived of the seal, register, and keys to the library and money-chests.

Masters and scholars of the three nations quitted the city in the course of the summer.[2]

Hus had conquered. If he had till then expressed himself about Wiclif with some degree of caution and reserve, he now resolutely placed himself at the head of the Bohemian Wiclifites. In his writings,

[1] See Berger, 30. The passage from Tempelfeld, which was already known to Palacky, has not been consulted in the more recent accounts of the controversy about the right of voting. See my ed. of Tempelfeld, *l. c.*, 135. "Quod rector universitatis et decanus facultatis arcium similiter et examinatores promovendorum in facultate arcium inantea eligi deberent alternatis vicibus, sic quod una mutacione regeret et decanus esset et examinator Bohemus et alia mutacione et per dimidium annum Teutonus non curando cuius nacionis existeret. Quod mandatum regium cum tres naciones scilicet Polonorum Bavarorum et Saxonum acceptare nollent, tanta supervenit nomine regis impressio."

[2] Comp. Höfler, *Joh. Hus*, 230. The matter is worthy of renewed investigation.

too, this alteration becomes clearly manifest. In his previous compositions he had adopted from his master only isolated thoughts and turns of discourse, and these in no great number: *his Latin writings of the years immediately following, are nothing but a meagre abstract, drawn from the abundant treasury of the English theologian.*

CHAPTER VI.

BURNING OF WICLIF'S BOOKS.

WHILE the leaders of the national movement in Prague were most heartily congratulating themselves on the results hitherto obtained, and were pouring forth from the pulpit their feelings of joy and gratitude towards the friends of the Czech cause, the inhabitants of the city began to be a little startled at the far-reaching effects of the recent events, and to be incensed with Hus and his companions, whom they blamed for the withdrawal of so many, generally speaking wealthy, residents. It may well be true that very many of the emigrants looked back with heart-felt longing upon Prague, and thought of its many incitements, but return was not possible. The hatred between Germans and Czechs had then risen to a height unknown before. This is to be perceived from the lament of a contemporary chronicler: "Old is the enmity, and all too deeply rooted, between Germans and Czechs; for as the Jews had once no fellowship with the Samaritans, so now the very sight of a German calls forth an aversion in the Czech."[1]

[1] "Antiquatum nempe odium et nimis radicatum est inter hec duo ydeomata Teutunicorum et Bohemorum, ut sicut

Of yet greater moment was the religious element. Those men who did not view the latest events from the immediate vicinity, shared the conviction that the Germans had quitted the soil of Prague for fear of being infected with the heresies of Wiclif.[1] The emigrants assuredly spread the fame of the Bohemian heresies in the remotest regions. In Germany and Italy, even in France and England, men told of the Wiclifites in Bohemia, and of their shameful doings; but it was not always the German masters who represented Bohemia as a veritable hotbed for heretical dogmas.[2]

After the departure of the German masters and scholars Zbinco stood alone, while Hus was at the height of his reputation; and the position of Zbinco towards the court was altogether what could be wished for the Wiclifite movement. In reality the books and articles of Wiclif were now sown broadcast over city and land. So long as the archbishop persisted in his obedience to Gregory XII., all measures against the Wiclifites proved unavailing; on the other hand, five adherents of Hus accused the archbishop to the Curia, and he actually received a citation on the 8th December, calling upon him to put in his defence.[3] In the meantime, however, an

Judæi non coutuntur Samaritis, sic ipsi Bohemo Teutunicus ad videndum sit gravis." Ludolph of Sagan, *l.c.*, 426, cap. 27.

[1] "Ad recessum a loco faciliorem pedem habuerunt, quia ibidem scisma et heresim vilem dominari verisimili coniecturacione videbant." Comp. also *ibid.* 430.

[2] See the recantation of Peter of Uniczow, in Appendix, No. X. Some interesting particulars will be found there.

[3] *Chron. Boh. Lipsiense:* "Anno d. 1409, dominico die, quo vocatur Populus Zion citatus est dominus archiepiscopus

event had occurred which all at once changed the situation of affairs. On the 2nd September, 1409, the archbishop had given in his submission to Pope Alexander V., and the Curia saw itself necessitated to change its mode of procedure. Zbinco despatched an embassy to Rome, at the head of which stood two clergymen, the Canon Jinoch and the bishop *in partibus*, Jaroslaw of Sarepta, and represented to the Pope that all the mischief in the kingdom of Bohemia proceeded from the Wiclifites; that the clergy, in consequence of the incentives of these men, were altogether insubordinate, and that the censures of the Church were entirely disregarded. The barons of the kingdom have been indoctrinated with the opinion that it is the place of the laity to guide the clergy, and King Wenzel has even been induced to lay hands on the property of the Church.[1] The Pope now put a stop to the proceedings against the archbishop, and conferred upon him, by a bull of 20th December, 1409, the commission to take measures against the heretical doctrines. Two masters in theology and two doctors of the canon law were to act as his advisers; the books of Wiclif were to be put away and brought into the presence of the archbishop, in order to withdraw them from the sight of the faithful people. Preaching was forbidden in any other than customary places, and no appeal to

a Wicklefistis (ad) Romanam Curiam." Comp. *Conc. Prag.*, 64.

[1] *Docum. Mag. Hus*, 189: "Quomodo in regno . . . . pullulassent errores et hereses ex libris Wiclef." Comp. *Chron. univ. Prag.*, where will be found the credentia to the Pope. The bull of 20th December, see *Doc.*, 374.

the papal court against these regulations was to have any force. The bull reached Prague only in 1410, and was received in the Wiclifite circles with unfeigned dislike. The archbishop was not misled by this repugnance. The commission, which he had called together in accordance with the papal bull, pronounced the judgment—which was likewise proclaimed by Zbinco at the summer Synod of 1410—that the books of Wiclif should be burnt, and preaching in the chapels and other places, with the exception of the authorised churches, should be interdicted. Of the books of Wiclif the following were mentioned by name:—1, Dialogus; 2, Trialogus; 3, De Incarnacione Verbi Divini; 4, De Corpore Christi; 5, De Trinitate; 6, De Ideis; 7, De Hypotheticis; 8, Decalogus; 9, De Universalibus Realibus; 10, De Simonia; 11, De Fratribus Dyscolis et Malis; 12, De Probacionibus Proposicionum; 13, De Attributis; 14, De Individuacione Temporis; 15, De Materia et forma; 16, De Dominio Civili; 17, Super ewangelia sermones per circulum anni.[1]

Against this decision the university was the first to raise its voice, on the 21st of June;[2] then Hus, who, four days later, in conjunction with seven others belonging to the university, addressed a solemn appeal to John XXIII., and delivered a protest alike against the command to burn the books as against the prohibition of unrestricted preaching in the chapels.[3] The appeal of Hus and his companions is a carefully elaborated document; which, in the first

[1] *Ibid.*, 378—385.
[2] *Ibid.*, 386.
[3] *Ibid.*, 387—396.

place, clearly and succinctly sets forth the whole matter, and in particular raises an energetic protest against the accusations of the archbishop, to the effect that the diocese of Prague is full of heretics. Against the prohibition of preaching in the chapels, thus also in Bethlehem, Hus points to the deed of foundation, which he has, to a great extent, introduced verbally into his appeal.

As regards the prohibiting of the possession of Wiclif's books, the appeal points out that only a fool, who is entirely devoid of acquaintance with the Bible and with canon law, could consign to the flames the logical, philosophical, moral, mathematical, theophysical books; as also those on matter and form, on ideas, etc., which contain many noble and glorious truths, but not a single error. Moreover, he urged, by the death of Alexander V. the authority entrusted to Zbinco for this prosecution had lapsed.

The university had meanwhile invoked the mediation of the king, and at his intervention the archbishop consented to postpone the execution of the sentence until the margrave Jost should have come to Prague from Moravia.[1] As, however, the arrival of the margrave was delayed, Zbinco caused Wiclif's books to be burnt on the 16th July. This *auto-da-fe* was carried into effect in the court of the archiepiscopal palace on the Hradschin, in the presence of the cathedral chapter and a great multitude of priests. More than two hundred MSS. were consumed, con-

[1] *Geschichtschr. d. hus. Bew.*, i. 21, 187: "Quod tota universitas visitet dominum regem ipsumque petat, ut talem impediat combustionem."

taining the works of Wiclif. Stress has been laid upon the fact that several of them were sumptuously bound. Yet only the smaller proportion of Wiclif's books which were to be found in Bohemia fell victims to the archbishop's injunction; for, as is related by Stephen of Dolein,[1] the Wiclifites publicly boasted that the bishop had burnt, indeed, some very renowned books of Wiclif, but not all. "We still have most of them, and are collecting others from every quarter, to transcribe and then possess them." Two days after this event the excommunication was pronounced upon Hus and his companions, and all who had not delivered up their copies of Wiclif, and this was proclaimed in all the churches of the diocese of Prague.

This action gave rise in Prague to an indescribable excitement. Thoroughly to appreciate its effect, we must bear in mind how passionately the populace, who had been aroused by the preaching of Hus and his friends, were wont during this year to espouse the cause of Wiclif. A Pole, who was spending some time in Prague as ambassador and bearer of letters, was found guilty of reviling Wiclif and his adherents; for this he was cudgelled by the irate multitude on St. Mark's Day. After the scene in the archbishop's palace, the excitement spread to the lowest strata of the population. In various places stormy scenes arose. Of the satirical ballads which were then sung at the expense of the archbishop, some are yet extant;[2] of the tumults the *Chronicle* of the University of

[1] *Antihussus, l.c.*, 386.
[2] See Appendix, No. V., and *Gesch. d. hus. Bew.*, i. 622.

Prague records several remarkable instances.[1] Hus himself gave expression from the pulpit to language in reference to these events which was only adapted to augment the prevailing disquiet among the people, if, at least, it is true that he spoke the following words:[2] "Behold, fulfilled is the prophecy which Jacobus de Taramo writes, that in the year 1409 one shall arise who will persecute the gospel, the epistles, and the faith of Christ. It is the Pope himself, who recently died, and of whom I know not whether he is in heaven or in hell, who writes upon his ass' skins, 'Let the archbishop only burn the books of Wiclif,' and yet there is much good contained in them." And after he had spoken a few words between, he continued: "Behold, I have appealed against the decrees of the archbishop, and still appeal. But will you also stand by me?" And all the people called out to him in the Bohemian language, "We will, and do stand by you." "It is time," continued Hus, "that he who will defend the law of God gird himself with the sword, after the example of the old covenant, and hold himself in readiness."

In another sermon he laments: "These prelates have procured from the Pope a bull, wherein the Pope enjoins that they are to burn the good and bad books of the magister Johannes Wicleff; for these books scandalise them greatly, because the prelates are chastised therein for their simony, pride, lewdness, avarice, and other vices. It cuts deep into

[1] See Palacky, *Gesch. v. Böhmen, l. c.*, 352, where all the passages bearing on the subject are collected.

[2] "In vulgari sermone" (Bohemico); see *Doc.*, 405.

their soul, too, that they are called therein poor men's preachers and beggars' officials, for they like best to rule as secular lords. But what stings them most is, that the secular authorities may justly and with good intention deprive them of their worldly possessions, and need not give them a single tithe."[1]

The archbishop's decree of 16th June, 1410, was far from having specified all the writings of Wiclif known in Bohemia. Among the condemned writings were, in point of fact, several of a perfectly harmless nature. Tractates of much greater importance were then assuredly read in that land; for Hus already employs them in 1411 and the subsequent year, and that in the most comprehensive manner. To their number belong the following: 1, De Triplici Vinculo Amoris; 2, De Ecclesia; 3, De Absolucione a pena et a culpa; 4, De Officio Regis; 5, De Christo et Suo Adversario Antichristo; 6, De Ordinibus Ecclesie; 7, Ad Argumenta Cuiusdam Emuli Veritatis; 8, De Fide Catholica; 9, De imaginibus; and even 10, De Dissensione Paparum.

The proceedings of the archbishop against the *Wiclifiana* seem to have first contributed to their thorough diffusion in Bohemia. The codex 3933 of the Palace Library at Vienna[2] enumerates ninety works of Wiclif with which men were acquainted in

[1] The sermon bears date, it is true, only of the year 1413 (preached on the Sixth Sunday after Epiphany, Novotny, ii. 42), but it is evident from the above that, on former occasions also, Hus expressed himself with like severity.

[2] 195*b*—196*b*. Not only are the works of Wiclif themselves specified (in red characters), but also the incipit and explicit of the same (in black characters). This catalogue was printed in Walter Waddington Shirley's work, *A Catalogue of the*

Bohemia, and adds, as a noteworthy piece of information, that there are many other works of Wiclif existing in Bohemia, of which also a considerable number is further enumerated. This MS. belonged, to be sure, to a friend of Wiclif's school, Paul of Slawikowitz, subsequently priest of St. Ægidius'.[1] The said Paul was admitted to the examination for the bachelor's degree at the University of Prague in the year 1395.[2] Since, as a student, he can hardly have been in the possession of such an expensive codex as that above mentioned; as, moreover, the theological writings of Wiclif were not at that time circulated in Prague; we are warranted in assuming that the books of Wiclif specified in the catalogue first became known to Paul of Slawikowitz at a later period, somewhere about the year 1410. Even though the catalogue should have been drawn up a few years later, which is hardly to be supposed however,[3] still it affords brilliant testimony to the activity

Original Works of John Wyclif, Oxford, 1865, 56—63. A second catalogue is likewise to be found there, which cannot be taken much into account, inasmuch as the time of its origin can be less exactly determined.

[1] An entry upon the inside of the cover says: "Liber Pauli de Slawikowitz." Another entry says, in verses:—

"Versa Berengarium, fuge Wicleff, cede Pikardis:
Implicat hic, errat hic, (hic) sacramenta retractat."

[2] *MM. historic. univ. Prag.*, i. 300, 308.

[3] Even if we have regard to the age of Paul of Slawikowitz, who was then a man of forty to fifty years. At a more advanced age he would hardly in this way have made himself acquainted with the more modern tendency. The owner of this catalogue is mentioned again in another MS. of the Vienna Court Library. There it reads: "Pertinens ad *Paulum* de Slavicovicz, qui fuit arcium baccalaureus, plebanus S. Ægidii et corrector cleri curie archiepiscopalis Pragensis." Comp. Buddensieg's edition of Wiclif's *De Christo*, etc., 22.

which prevailed in the literary, and particularly in the theological, domain in Bohemia during those years.

The fact that the archbishop had condemned more especially the philosophic writings of Wiclif, was admirably turned to account by the disciples of the latter, inasmuch as, during the last days of July and the first days of August, they publicly defended several works of Wiclif. This would be accompanied with the usual amount of display, on the present occasion perhaps with a greater display than usual, and could hardly fail of augmenting the excitement already rife among the inhabitants of Prague. As early as a year before, the adherents of the Realistic school seem to have got up a similar pageantry.[1]

The magister John Hus himself opened the lists. He made known in advance, by public handbills, that on the next Sunday (27th July) he would defend Wiclif's book of the uncreated, blessed, and adorable Trinity. His apologetic discourse is still extant. To how great an extent Wiclif's influence is to be traced in it will be seen from the fact, that he adopts whole passages bodily from Wiclif's tractates; so notably the familiar and oft-cited passage, in which he says that from the beginning he has made it a rule, whenever he finds a better opinion upon any matter, to give up the old one. This passage is

[1] The so-called scientific tournament at Prague in 1409; Höfler, *Der Mag. Joh. Hus*, 255. But Hus must just about that time have been laid aside by a severe illness; could he then deliver the opening discourse at this tournament? Comp. *Doc.*, 181. In other respects, too, much that is improbable is to be met with in this history of the tournament.

taken, word for word, from Wiclif's tractate, *De universalibus*.[1]

For the 28th of July, Jacobus of Mies (Jakoubek) announced the defence of Wiclif's Decalogue. Even the announcement says that he will meet those who condemn the *Decalogus*, in that they say it contains manifest heresies.

For the 29th of July was announced the defence of Wiclif's tractate, *De probacionibus proposicionum*, by Simon of Tissnow; for the 31st of July, that of Wiclif's dissertation on Ideas, by Prokop of Pilsen; and finally, on the 6th of July, the defence of Wiclif's tractate, *De universalibus*, by Zdislas of Wartenberg, called of *Zweretic*. The addresses are still extant in several MSS. If one could yet doubt that in addition to the serious design, a lively demonstration against the proceedings of the archbishop was likewise aimed at, the reading of Tissnow's defence of the said tractate of Wiclif[2] may amply suffice to convince of the true state of matters. With the most unsparing banter, certainly reckoning upon the effect with the audience, the conduct of the archbishop is lashed by Simon of Tissnow.[3] "Tell me,

[1] See under Book II. The announcement of the addresses is from the *Chron. univ. Prag.* See *Documenta mag. Hus*, 399, 400.

[2] Selections from all the apologetic addresses, with the exception of that of Hus, already printed, will be found in the Appendix, No. VI.

[3] Palacky has a passage of this address, not however taken from the original source, but communicated from an Invectiva contra Hussitas, see *Gesch. von Böhmen*, iii. 1, 255. What is meant is manifestly the Invectiva anonymi contra Hussitas (scripta post annum, 1432) in the *Geschichtschr. der Hus. Bewegung*, i. 621.

you poor innocent little tractate," says Tissnow, looking down compassionately upon it, "what have you done to your judges and prelates that is so very wicked? Certainly you have well rebuked their demon of pride, and chidden their ambition." "Ah, no," says the tractate, "that is not my province, you know; that pertains to the book *De civili dominio*, which has now become my companion in suffering." "But now you have surely lashed the insatiable and unfathomable avarice of the priests?" "Ah, no, that was done by the sermons on the gospels for the Church year, which now also are condemned with me to execution." "But perchance you have hard pressed the detestable heresy of simony in the said writings?" "Alas! it was not *I* who did this, the tractate *De Simonia* deals with this. That is now in sooth condemned along with me." "Then it must be you have commended evangelical poverty, which is so displeasing to the prelates?" "Well, no, these things are not contained in me, but in the Dialogue and the Trialogue, which are now in like manner condemned with me." "I fear now, my dear little tractate, you have been accusing the ignorance of the clergy, their stupidity and indolence?" "Dear defender, do not weary me any longer with your questioning. I have done none of all those things of which you suspect me. I am put into the hands of innocent young men, that by the help of me they may learn to prove theses." In this strain it goes on. One sees from the composition of the tractate that Simon of Tissnow has before his mind a numerous audience. He turns to the disciples, for whom the book, "the bread with which they have

heretofore been nourished," is consumed. The honey is now withdrawn from their lips, and there is no solace, because those who have condemned the book are not able in any way to replace it with a better. In like manner he makes appeal to the older ones. He will never, to the longest day of his life, assent to such impious condemnation, except he is taught better. "But what shall I say," exclaims Simon, "of this Zbinco, who carried out the counsels of these judges? Perhaps he is to be excused on account of his ignorance. Spare him then, and pray for him." Simon of Tissnow was the one who inveighed most severely against the condemnation of Wiclif's writings. Much calmer was the defence of Prokop of Pilsen, though this is not altogether wanting in attacks on Wiclif's judges. He recals to mind the profound theological and philosophic truths which are contained in this man's writings: long time indeed had they been forgotten, by Wiclif were they first awakened anew. Love to his country, Prokop urges, has roused him to the defence of Wiclif, whom in England very many, and as we may hope, good, men call the evangelical doctor; whose life and walk is generally commended, and in particular by those "poor in spirit," who are nevertheless rich in holy memory. Only the rich in the world, the avaricious, the luxurious and wanton, call him a deceived man and a heretic, while in reality the purest truth is contained in his books.

Why do they not burn the books of Mahomet, or of the Jews? an argument to which Zdislas of Zweretic returns with yet greater emphasis.

With the address of this last the interest in these

addresses seems to have reached its culminating point. Not with the relentless irony of Simon of Tissnow, but with deeper earnestness, extensive information, and appeals to the fathers, does Zdislas censure the procedure of the archbishop. He charges the judges of Wiclif with the rankest ingratitude, since they condemn books to which they owe their knowledge. Nay, if it be said: Because Wiclif's books have infected the hearts of so many men, they are to be burnt; then it follows that we must burn all men who infect the hearts of others. Who in the wide world, exclaims Zdislas, will then remain unconsigned to the flames? this sentence would touch the judges, and all of us. Zdislas dwells very long upon the judgment pronounced by Jerome upon Origen, who was in some respects a heretic.

As compared with the three former lectures, that of John of Giczin[1] shows a great falling off. Yet it is not without interest, since it contains some noteworthy communications, *e.g.*, that a number of Wiclif's writings, even after the burning, remained in the hands of the judges. His position as regards obedience towards Zbinco, is at the same time distinctly apparent. Giczin invokes the aid of God, that he may not obey the archbishop.[2] As regards the judges of Wiclif, he relates that one of them, Johannes Peklo, had, according to his own confession, been in hell, and had seen the English

[1] Giczin's tractate is found, not in the *Cod. un. Prag.*, X. E., 24, where the others are, but in *Cod. Pal. Vind.*, 4002, where it appears along with the others, with the exception of that of Jacobell.

[2] "Ut eorum mandato non obediam."

magister there. Giczin characterises this as a shameless lie.

John Peklo was priest at St. Egidius', and one of the most zealous adversaries of Hus. When, in the year 1411, Wenzel cut off the revenues of the clergy, Peklo was a great loser.[1] Among the testimonies against Hus, that of Peklo had much weight. He deposed that Hus had repeatedly preached: We have no need of the Pope in order to be saved.[2]

That such discourses could have only an exciting effect upon the masses, admits of no doubt. The adherents of Hus already represent an imposing power. In the neighbouring districts people could not restrain their surprise, that the collective power of the prelates in Bohemia was insufficient to extirpate from Bohemia this accursed heretic, the son of perdition.[3]

Very instructive with regard to the number of Hus' followers in the year 1410 is the answer which Hus addressed to the Englishman, Richard Fitz, who had encouraged him to continue in his hitherto so salutary labours. In his reply, Hus speaks in an overflowingly feeling manner of the sweetness, power, and strength of this letter[4] of his English friend, and

[1] *Docum.*, 735.

[2] *Ibid.*, 178.

[3] *Cod.*, iv. Q. 87 (fol. 199 *a*), univ. Wratisl.: "beate Mariæ. . . filio, quem persequitur vestre diocesis filius perdicionis Huso. Mirum quod omnes prelati in Bohemia non valent virum maledictum hereticum a suo regno extirpare." Letter of the abbot of Heiligenkreuz in Lower Austria, to the abbot James of Sedlitz. Without date, but unquestionably belonging to this period.

[4] The letter of 8th September, 1410, in *Opera Hussi*, fol. 201 *b*, with complete dating. Without indication of the year in *Geschichtschr. der hus. Bewegung*, ii. 212. The earlier edition contains a multitude of better readings. The answer

spiritual kinsman: Though all other writings in the world should be blotted out by Antichrist, yet this letter would suffice to the believers for their spiritual health. He had read it publicly in his sermon to the assembled people—there might be about ten thousand persons present—and had added: "Lo, our dearest brother and fellow-soldier Richard, the companion of Wiclif in the toils of the Gospel, has written you a letter of such power, that for my part, if I possessed no other writing, I were yet ready gladly to present my life an offering for the gospel of Christ; and of a truth, with the Lord's help, I will yet do so." At the entreaty of the believers, Hus had now—as he farther relates—translated this letter into the Bohemian. He is full of gratitude that, through the exertions of his English friend, so great favours have come out of the blessed England to Bohemia.

"The Bohemian people, barons and knights, counts and commoners, long and thirst for the truth. You may learn, dear brother—he writes—that the people will hear nothing but the Holy Scripture, above all, the Gospel, and the Epistles. And wherever, in any town, or in a village or castle, a preacher of the sacred truth appears, there the people flock together in whole crowds, despising the clergy who are not able to furnish it."

---

of Hus is to be found likewise in the *Doc. mag. Joannis Hus*, 12. The most descriptive passages therein are: "Richardus, M. Joannis Wicleff in evangelii laboribus consocius, scripsit vobis. . . Populus non vult audire nisi sacram scripturam presertim evangelium et epistolas. Et ubicunque in civitate vel oppido sive villa aut castro apparet sancte veritatis predicator catervatim confluunt populi, clerum indispositum aspernantes."

"Our king, his whole court, the barons and the common people, are in favour of the word of Christ." Specially to be observed is that which Hus says concerning the itinerant preachers. In fact: in the whole way and manner in which Hus apprehends the meaning of the preacher's office, he is altogether a true disciple of Wiclif.

After the death of ALEXANDER V. the affairs of Hus were entrusted to a commission of four cardinals.[1] These called together all the doctors then resident in Bologna—where John XXIII., the successor of Alexander V., held his court—and laid before them Wiclif's books for examination. By a majority they came to the conclusion that Zbinco was not warranted in having the books burnt.

The party of the archbishop, however, was not idle. They represented to the Pope the proceedings of Hus during the last months, and urgently craved that Hus, as suspected of heresy, should be summoned before the Romish Curia.

John XXIII. now committed the whole affair to Cardinal Otto of Colonna, who on the 25th August charged the archbishop to proceed with all severity, and even with an appeal to the secular arm, against the innovators.[2]

Hus found, nevertheless, powerful protectors at

[1] "Tandem causa appellacionis nondum inchoata et domino Alexandro defuncto dominus papa Johannes XXIII. causam premissam quatuor commisit cardinalibus, qui convocantes universos doctores theologiæ . . . libros Wiclef examinandos commiserunt, ubi inter cetera per maiorem partem fuit conclusum, quod libri Wiclef non debeant comburi."

[2] *Ibid.*, 190, 401: "Invocantes eciam ad hoc si opus fuerit auxilium brachii secularis."

the court of the king. The queen, and through her mediation the king too, numerous persons from among the nobility, as also the university and the citizens of Prague, interceded for him. At that time there was residing in Prague Antonio of Monte Catino, who had come to notify to the king the accession of John XXIII. to the papal throne. When, about the middle of September, Antonio was preparing for his homeward journey, he received an autograph letter of the king and queen to the Pope, in which they expressed their dissatisfaction with the burning of the books, and entreated the Pope to annul the decision in question and free the preaching of its restraints. An energetic protest was likewise made against the branding of Bohemia with heresy. The queen prays in particular that the sentence affecting Bethlehem may be deprived of force. Similar letters were addressed to the college of cardinals; and the barons of Krawar, Potenstein, and others, as also the magistracy of Prague, raised their voice in the same sense.[1] But shortly after this, on the 20th September, Hus was summoned by the Cardinal Colonna to appear personally at Rome in his own defence.[2] By this course of action the excitement already prevailing in Prague was only augmented, and the protectors of Hus were more instant in the renewal of their intercessions on his behalf. Instead of repairing in person to Bologna, Hus sent thither his friend, John of Jesenic, with two other theologians; simultaneously the king and queen appealed to the Pope

[1] *Doc.*, 409-415.

[2] As regards the date, see Berger, *Johannes Hus und König Sigismund*, 70.

and the college of cardinals in favour of Hus. The king desired that the magister Hus might be released from the necessity of a personal appearance, "in consideration of the perils of the way;"[1] in his native land he would present himself before every judge, as also before the whole university of Prague, and humbly reply to all charges. The plenipotentiary of the king, the doctor John Naas, was commissioned to obtain for the master John Hus freedom from the necessity of putting in a personal appearance.[2] But all these steps were in vain; the grounds alleged by Hus' advocates were deemed unsatisfactory, so that these advocates now applied to the Pope. Even before the papal auditor, John of Thomariis, had delivered judgment, in the middle of February, 1411, Colonna placed Hus under the ban of excommunication, on the ground of disobedience and obstinate refusal to appear.[3] As related by the *University Chronicle*, it cost the archbishop fine sums to prevent the citation becoming null and void.

The excommunication against Hus was published in all the churches of Prague, with the exception of two, whose priests refused to proclaim it; and subsequently, because the writ of sequestration attaching to the possessions of Zbinco was not taken off, was pronounced upon the town council of Prague; and finally an interdict was placed upon the city.[4] This

[1] "Propter vicissim pericula." *Doc.*, 425.
[2] *Ibid.*, 426.
[3] *Ibid.*, 192, 202. Comp. Berger, *l. c.*, 72.
[4] *Docum. Mag. Hus*, 429. That the sequestration was attached in consequence of the burning of the books, see in Palacky, *Gesch. des Husitenthums*, 139.

measure remained ineffective, for the preaching and service were held as before. Nay, even some of the priests devoted to the archbishop were banished the land, and the cathedral treasures brought to Karlstein for safe keeping.[1] During this time the people stood on the side of Hus; in divers places tumultuous scenes were witnessed.

Inasmuch as the religious strifes in Bohemia exerted an unfavourable influence upon the political situation of the country, Wenzel, in the year 1411, attempted at any price to restore ecclesiastical peace in his land; and the archbishop had become more inclined in consequence of recent events, perhaps, also of admonitions from the Pope, to consent to terms of peace. As early as the month of June Stephen of Palecz elaborated a theological judgment, in which he proved that the Archbishop of Prague would be fully justified in removing the interdict.[2] About the same time the Pope transferred the case against Hus to a commission consisting of four cardinals, and thus withdrew it from the influence of Colonna. On the 3rd July, the archbishop on the one hand, and the masters of the university on the other, placed their controversy in the hands of the king. A court of arbitration, consisting of the elector Rudolph of Saxony, the Vayvode Stibor of Transylvania, the Lord Steward Lacek of Krawar, with seven other persons of high ecclesiastical or secular rank, passed judgment three days later, to the effect that the archbishop should entreat the

[1] See on this Palacky, *l. c.*, 267; Berger, *l. c.*, 73.

[2] *Doc.*, 432; the documents for that which follows *ib.*, 434-442.

favour of the king, and despatch to the Pope an assurance that there are no heretics in Bohemia, and that the king himself will extirpate any errors there may chance to be. Excommunications and interdicts are to be withdrawn; the Church possessions, on the other hand, to be restored to the archbishop.

On the 1st September Hus, reading a letter which he had addressed to John XXIII., declared in the Carolinum, in presence of the rector and the assembled university, that he did not forsake the doctrine of the Church, and that the reports which were in circulation about his doctrines were inventions of his enemies. Moreover, he declared himself ready to justify himself, and to recal false doctrines in case such doctrines were brought home to him, or to suffer death.[1] A second letter was at the same time despatched to the College of Cardinals. In this Hus made emphatic reference to his innocence, and begged, on bended knee, that he might be released from the necessity of personally appearing. The draft of the letter which Zbinco was to send to the Pope is still extant; he declares therein that after careful examination he knows nothing of the existence of heretical errors, and that no one has been convicted of them. The letter, after all, was not sent off.[2] Fresh misunderstandings broke out, and the archbishop resolved to apply to King Sigismund. In a letter to Wenzel, from Leitomischl, on the 5th September, he complains[3] that he has now for five weeks in vain sought an audience with

[1] *Doc.*, 18-20; 271, 20*f*
Ibid., 441.
[3] *Ibid.*, 443-446.

the king, and equally in vain has awaited the fulfilment of promises; in the churches, now as before, heresies are preached, and, in particular, the Pope's authority passionately assailed, etc.

Before he had reached his journey's end he expired suddenly, on the 28th September, 1411.[1] With his death the religious movement in Bohemia entered upon a new phase. Till then books and articles of Wiclif had formed the subject of an embittered controversy. Henceforth it is the papacy itself and the whole existing ecclesiastical order, which are combated by Hus and his adherents,—with the weapons of Wiclif.

[1] Steph. Dolan. Pez, *Thes.*, iv. 2, 418. Cochlaeus, *Hist. Hussitarum*, 20.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CONTROVERSY ON INDULGENCES IN PRAGUE OF THE YEAR 1412.

AMONG the antagonists who sharply opposed the magister Hus at the time of the Council of Constance, we find the English magister John Stokes. This man had already come to a very sharp rencounter with Hus and his whole party three years before.

In the spring of 1411, the knight,[1] Hartung van Clux, who had been sent by his master, King Henry IV. of England, appeared at the Court of Sigismund, bearing the proposals of his master to Sigismund for the conclusion of a close alliance.[2] Among those who accompanied him was the licentiate of laws of the Cambridge University, John Stokes, who had been repeatedly employed by his sovereign on diplomatic missions.

In the first half of September 1411 these two

[1] Krummel's art of translating makes of this *miles* "a soldier;" *Gesch. der böhm. Ref.*, 242.

[2] A very valuable collection of the notices having reference to Clux is found in Lenz, *König Sigismund und Heinrich V. von England*, 31 *ff.* Quite recently also this has been given in the "Acts of the Diet under King Sigismund," as also in Caro, "Aus der Kanzlei Kaiser Sigismunds, *Arch. f. österr. Gesch.*, 59. Regarding Stokes, too, a few notices are to be met with in Lenz.

came to Prague. When it was known in this city that "some magisters or doctors from the kingdom of England" had arrived, and had taken up their quarters for a time in a certain house,[1] a deputation of Prague masters, bachelors, and students presented themselves to greet the strangers. A banquet was prepared in honour of them, and Stokes was invited to the college. The latter, however, by the advice of Hartung van Clux, not only declined the proffered honour, but also made use of some expressions on account of which the Bohemian magisters felt aggrieved. Stokes, namely, is reported to have said, "He who reads Wiclif's books, or makes them his study, must of necessity, however well-disposed he may be, or sound in the faith, in the course of time lapse into heresy." For this declaration the foreign magister was called to account by Hus, for it contained an insult to Bohemia and to the University of Oxford. He challenged him on the 13th September to the public maintenance of his proposition, or to the withdrawal of it.[2]

Stokes first corrected the stating of the proposition in dispute. He had said: "If I were acquainted with any one who read or studied Wiclif's books, or

[1] Hus, *Opera*, 108*a*: "Quod quidam magistri vel doctores de regno Angliæ in quadam domo pausam facerent."

[2] The public announcements are printed in the *Doc. mag. Joh. Hus.*, 447. The text (from a Wittenau MS.) is corrupt. Line 4 from below we have to read: "Nec non ad regem Romanorum electum, verumtamen si placet dicto M. Johanni Hus baccalario formato in sacra pagina se pretendenti vel cuicunque alteri ex suis complicibus vel adherentibus in hac parte venire Parisius . . . . vel ad alium studium." 448, line 9 from above: "Quod vix esset reperire;" l. 11: "Involveretur in heresim."

was minded to receive and hold his opinions, I would at once counsel him, for the sake of God and of brotherly love, to desist therefrom ; because I know the ill results of such studies, such that there is hardly a man to be found, were he never so well-disposed towards what is good, who would not be therein entangled in heresy." Stokes declared himself ready only in Paris, or before the Romish Curia, or at some other university except Prague, to take up Hus' challenge.

Hus nevertheless undertook the defence of Wiclif. His defence is still extant,[1] and is of special interest, by reason of the fact that Hus therein adopts word for word an important passage, treating of Anne of Luxemburg, the consort of Richard II. of England, from the pages of Wiclif's tractate, *De triplici vinculo amoris*.[2]

During his stay in Prague John Stokes likewise had in his hands a tractate which was ascribed to Hus, wherein was defended the (Wiclifian) doctrine of the remanence of the bread. Hus, on the other hand, at the session of the Council on the 7th June, denied being the author of such a tractate.[3]

How greatly the contents of Wiclif's works had told upon Hus, and how much their influence made itself felt at this time, is attested in particular by the sermon which was held in this same year.[4] Its

[1] "Replica mag. Joannis Hus contra Anglicum Johannem Stokes Wicleffi calumniatorem celebrata dominica post Nativitatem Mariæ, a. 1411."

[2] See thereon the subsequent observations; Book II., ch. viii.

[3] *Doc.*, 277.

[4] *Opp.*, ii. 47*ff*.

object is to justify Wenzel's conduct towards the clergy. Hus, for this purpose, introduces into his discourse with verbal fidelity the expatiations of Wiclif on the duties of the king, nay—what is but very rarely the case, and in this form hardly occurs again with Hus—he even mentions Wiclif as his authority. This sermon contains in addition propositions from Wiclif's *Trialogus*, and from his tractate, *De ecclesia*. An analogous relation exists in the case of the following sermon, preached in the same year, about All Hallows' tide, and of the tractate which he committed to writing on the 10th February, 1411 : *Contra occultum adversarium*.[1]

Much greater, however, was the influence which Wiclif acquires over Hus in the struggle of the latter against the Pope's bulls of indulgences.

Against the abuse which was made in those days of indulgences, on the part of the Romish Curia, not only the friends, but also the opponents of Hus were constrained to raise their voice. In a particularly emphatic manner did Ludolph of Sagan reprimand those who carried into effect the papal bulls of indulgences, as promising to the people more than they are able to perform, as giving more than they possess. Everything, he says, was in these days obedient to money.[2]

Of a very different order, to be sure, was the opposition offered by Hus to the papacy in this matter.

In the autumn of 1411 John XXIII. summoned Christendom to the conflict against the king, Ladislas

[1] In the latter are to be met with passages from the *Trialogus*, the tractate, *De simonia*, and elsewhere.

[2] *Cat. abb. Sag. SS. rer Sil.*, ii. 209.

of Naples, the powerful friend and protector of Gregory XII. In two bulls, of 9th September and 2nd December, he urged on the crusade against this king, as an excommunicated person, a perjured man, schismatic, etc. To all who would put at the Pope's disposal, for the conflict against him, money, or their own life, would be granted an indulgence such as otherwise only the actual crusaders were able to obtain.

That passionate scenes would be witnessed in Bohemia, in consequence of the appearing of the papal bulls, was to be pretty clearly recognised as early as the first days of March. So early as this, people in Prague began to attack the papal power at the roots. It was on the 3rd March, 1412, that, in the Bethlehem chapel there, a legal deed was drawn up in regard to certain points of doubt, whose resolution the magister Hus attempted, and on that account embodied them in an instrument prepared by a notary, "because people are wont to give greater credence to such a document."[1] Altogether three questions are raised, of which the third is of less significance: Whether it cannot be established from the writings of the doctors that some people of the host of Pharaoh which was drowned in the Red Sea,

[1] This deed, which contains some essential moments for the course of Hus' development, is to be found in the edition of Hus' works under the title, "Tractatus de tribus dubiis factis in Holomutz, quæ idiotæ asserunt pro vero et tanquam idem"—*Opera*, fol. 167*b*—169*b*. It is likewise to be met with, printed from a MS. in the Vienna Palace Library, in Pez, *Thes. anecd.*, iv., 2, 426—430: "Copia instrumenti declaracionem certorum dubiorum magistri Joh. Hus continentis." An abstract is likewise given by Cochlæus, *Hist. Hussitarum*, 24. Höfler and Palacky have overlooked the document.

or some of the inhabitants of Sodom were saved? More important is the second question: Whether any one can be saved, even though he does not confess to a priest? Of the greatest importance, however, is the first: Whether one can believe in the Pope? Hus answers this question in a negative sense, and it is significant that he has drawn all the arguments entirely from Wiclif's writings.[1] The second question he answers to this effect: A man can be saved, even though he does not confess to the priest. The third question, too, he answers exactly in the words which Wiclif is fond of citing, and which are found in various works of his.[2]

Upon this well prepared soil the papal bulls now fell.

When the intelligence of the crusade reached Prague, the archbishopric was still without a chief ruler. The successor of Zbinco was Albik of Uniczow, doctor of laws and of medicine, and master of arts, until that time physician in ordinary to the king.[3] The dean of Passau, Wenzel Tiem, who delivered to him the pallium, was also the bearer of the papal bulls against Ladislas of Naples. On the part of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities of the land no objection was raised against the publication

[1] The passage is dealt with in the second part of this volume, chapter vi.

[2] "Ecce manifeste dicit Hieronymus, quod aliqui Ægyptii . . . . sint salvati. Ex illo habetur . . . . quod de nullo nos mortales homines sine revelacione et sine scriptura sacra debemus asserere, quod eternaliter sit damnatus."

[3] *Geschichtschr. der hus. Beweg.*, iii. 230. There it is said of him: "But because he was a greedy German and penurious." . . . *Ibid.*, ii. 70. "Hic Albicus diffamatus est a nido Wiclefistarum usque ad mortem et se purgavit. . . ."

thereof, and so the preachers of indulgences came forth with beat of drum into the public places, and directed the people to the cathedral, to the churches at the Teyn and at the Wissehrad, where the money-boxes were set up. There soon opened up now a formal trade in indulgences, for these were vended to middle-men for the deaneries and parishes. They farm the indulgences, complains Hus, to the highest bidders.[1]

In opposition to the sermons of the last-named, the theological faculty entered the lists for the right of the Popes to the forgiveness of sins, and to the granting of indulgences. We learn from the state paper relating to this matter,[2] that the declarations of Hus moved entirely within the tracks of Wiclif. The main blow of Hus was delivered when he announced for the 7th of June a great disputation in the large hall of the Carolinum, on the question :[3] Whether it is permitted by the word of Christ, and redounds to the honour of God, to the welfare of the Christian people, and to the profit of the kingdom, to recommend the Pope's bulls for the crusade against Ladislas and his companions. The theological faculty sought in vain to prevent the delivery of the address. It took place on the appointed day in presence of a numerous audience.[4]

[1] See Krummel, *l.c.*, 249; comp. also *Documenta mag. Hus*, 223. *Proc. Notar.*, *l.c.*, 76.

[2] Printed *Doc.*, 448—450.

[3] The address is printed, *Opera*, 184, as "Quæstio magistri Joh. Hus de indulgenciis sive de cruciatu pape Johannis xxiii., fulminata contra Ladislaum Apuliæ regem."

[4] Berger, *l.c.*, 77. Krummel, *l.c.*, 258; it was keen, telling, and really crushing.

As already observed, it has been said of this address that it stands out as the pre-eminent work among the genuine writings of Hus, and is in its style a model of acute and telling argumentation. Lechler has already pointed out the similarity of underlying thought in this dissertation with the doctrines of Wiclif.[1] That is saying too little. In this writing all the arguments, down to the details, are adopted with verbal fidelity from different tractates of Wiclif. *From the defining of the indulgence onwards, everything is the property of the latter.* The most weighty parts are derived from that chapter of Wiclif's tractate, *De ecclesia*, which treats of indulgences, and are taken word for word; other lengthy amplifications are derived with the same verbal fidelity from Wiclif's treatise, *De absolucione a culpa et a pena*, and single propositions of less weight are to be found in other tractates of Wiclif. Remarkable to say, Wiclif's *Cruciata* has been least turned to account, although we might have expected this to be the first used.[2]

The doctors of the theological faculty delivered a counter-oration, but without success. The sympathies of the hearers were enlisted most on the side of Jerome. For this reason the chronicler also says: When this *actum* was over, many more students accompanied the magister Jerome than the magister Hus; for the discourse pleased them which he held at this disputation.[3]

[1] Lechler, *l.c.*, 178.

[2] Further illustrations see in Book II.

[3] Starí letopisové, translated into German by Jos. Jungmann, in the *Geschichtschr. der hus. Beweg.*, iii. 231.

The opposition to the indulgences now separated for ever the old friends and companions, Hus from Stanislas, Stephen, and others. Hus himself says: "The sale of the indulgences, and the preaching of a crusade against Christians, first separated me from this doctor.[1] For if he will himself confess the truth," adds Hus, "he will find that he said of the articles of indulgence, which he passed to me with his own hand, that they contain palpable errors. I preserve them to this day as a witness. Afterwards, truly, he took counsel with another colleague, and has gone into the other camp. I said to him the last time—for since then I have not conversed with him again: 'A friend to me is Palecz, a friend (amica), the truth; of these two one must give the truth the preference.'" In another place Hus says, "And for all this Doctor Stephen Palecz was to blame, formerly when he loved the truth my faithful friend and second Stanislas. And they all rose against us, because we would not consent to the bull of the Pope and the crusade against King Ladislas of Naples."[2]

A few days after the address in the Carolinum, a crowd led by Wok of Waldstein, one of the king's favourites, burnt the papal bulls,[3]—an incident the effects of which were felt far beyond the precincts of the capital. "We must rather obey the honest master Hus," people then cried in Prague, "than the deceitful crew of adulterers and simonists." Wenzel, who, for all that he did, was accused by

[1] *Opera*, 264*b*; comp. *Doc.*, 246.

[2] John Hus' Sermons, German by Novotny, i. 49.

[3] Ludolph of Sagan. See the description of the procession (Bk. I., ch. 29) in the second vol. of the *Geschichtschr. der hus. Bewegung*, 171, 203

the opponents of the movement of over-great leniency, now had recourse to some sterner measures; the magistrates were enjoined henceforth most severely to punish all public railing at the Pope, and all resistance offered to the papal bulls. And so in reality, three persons of the humbler classes, Martin, John, and Stanislas, who had loudly contradicted the preachers during the service, and called the indulgence a deception, were apprehended, and, despite the entreaties of Hus, were beheaded.[1] Many others besides were arrested, tortured, and imprisoned. The people, however, began to assume a threatening air, and lauded as martyrs the three who had been executed. Seeing this temper among the people, the magistrates liberated a few who had been incarcerated during the recent tumult.

And this—Hus afterwards declared from the pulpit—I report as a faithful chronicle, that our posterity upon the case arising may follow this example. The archbishop was now called upon to indemnify the owners of the books which had been consumed. Upon his refusal to do so, Wenzel cut off his revenues.

The theological faculty had, meanwhile, afresh condemned the forty-five articles, and added to them six others which proceeded from Hus, as erroneous or heretical. The king forbade the teaching of them in an edict of the 10th of July, which was proclaimed to the doctors, masters, priests, and clerics from the council-house of the Old Town.[2]

[1] Hus' Sermons, *l.c.*, p. 49. Exact details in the Starí letopisové, *l.c.*, 232.

[2] *Docum.*, 451.

Despite the prevailing excitement, Hus continued to defend articles of Wiclif in public lectures, and, 1. That those who neglect to preach the Word of God on account of the Pope's excommunication are excommunicated, and on the day of judgment will be dealt with as traitors. 2. A priest or deacon may preach God's Word, even without permission of the Pope or bishop. 3. The secular power has a right to deprive unfaithful priests of their *temporalia*. 4. The tithes are nothing but alms. 5. No one can be a secular lord, prelate, or bishop, who is living in a state of mortal sin.[1]

The whole material for the defence of these propositions, Hus drew from the armoury of Wiclif. The treatise in particular, in which the subject of the third article was handled, is taken in great part word for word from Wiclif's comprehensive tractate *De ecclesia*.

An attempt at accommodation, made by King Wenzel at his castle of Zebrak, proved ineffectual. Meanwhile, also, the parochial clergy of Prague had appealed to the Pope, with passionate complaints against Hus and his friends, John of Jesenitz, Zdislas of Wartenberg, Jacob of Mies, Prokop of Pilsen, and Marek of Königgrätz, and had implored his protection. In doing so, they of course touched upon the events of the last two years, and as well the heresies as notably the controversy about the indulgences were depicted with much animation.[2] Their advocate was Michael of Deutschbrod, who likewise appears henceforth as one of the most active opponents of

[1] Printed *Opera*, i., fol. 111*a*—134*b*.
[2] See *Documenta magistri Joannis Hus*, 457—461.

Hus. Upon this the Pope took the case of Hus out of the hands of Cardinal Brancas, and committed it to Cardinal Peter Stefaneschi, of St. Angelo, with instructions to proceed against Hus without farther consideration for him. The cardinal at once enhanced the penalties of Colonna's sentence, and laid Hus under the greater excommunication.[1] This judgment had to be proclaimed with the greatest solemnity, in all its terrible import, in the city of Prague.

According to the injunctions of a second bull, Hus was to be apprehended and delivered up to the Archbishop of Prague or the Bishop of Leitomischl; the Bethlehem chapel was to be levelled to the ground;[2] the adherents of Hus, in case they would not abjure the heresy, were to be excommunicated, and failing their submission within thirty days of this event, to be summoned before the Romish Curia. The others were to be examined in a regular manner by Michael of Deutschbrod.

In reality an attack was made by Prague citizens upon the Bethlehem chapel on the 2nd of October, without, however, their succeeding in destroying it. Soon the interdict produced its effect in Prague; Hus, for the satisfaction of his conscience, asked of the magisters Martin and Nicholas of Milicin, whether he ought to obey it. An ominous fermentation arose in the city; even in the university matters came to fierce contentions, and Stanislas of Znaim and Stephen of Palecz inveighed strenuously in word

[1] *Ibid.*, 461; see the notary Prokop, *l.c.*, 25.

[2] The contents of the second bull are given by the notary Prokop, *l.c.*, 26.

and writing against Hus, and his adherents and doctrines.[1] The sermon of Stanislas, delivered by him in presence of the Duke Ernest of Austria, in St. Mary's, before the Freudenhof,[2] is directed against those five articles of Wiclif which Hus had defended in the course of this year. More severe is that of his friend Palecz against Wiclif; Wiclif is a heretic, and that of a much more dangerous kind than Arius or Sabellius once was. These had at least acted with perfect candour. Wiclif, on the other hand, intrenched his errors behind countless texts of Scripture, so that one must possess talent and scholastic lore to be able to recognise them, and to protect oneself against them. The Pope, according to Wiclif's teaching, has no more authority than a simple bishop or priest, the orders are of human invention, auricular confession and the veneration of relics are good for nothing, and the same with the whole of the ceremonies.

These, adds Palecz, are errors from the Dialogue and the Trialogue. Wiclif opposes in general the immunities and secular possessions of the clergy; the priests are to be poor, as the apostles were. See—thus Palecz closed his sermon—how timorous their faith is. They dare not trust themselves to travel abroad with it; for if they were to repair to the Romish Curia or elsewhere,—for example, to

[1] *Ibid.*, 27; where the discourse of Palecz is furnished, so far as regards its essential contents. This discourse and that of Stanislas were delivered during the stay of the Duke Ernest of Austria; see *Doc.*, 311. Ernest resided at Prague during October.

[2] To be found in the *Cod. pal. Vindob.* 4933.

Germany,—and would not give up their faith, they would be burnt as heretics.[1]

Hus, meanwhile, had appealed from the decision of the Curia to a general council, and finally to Jesus Christ as the supreme judge.[2] The intervention of his friend Jesenitz, on the 18th December, 1412, and the proof that the excommunication was devoid of legal force, of course availed nothing. Hus expresses himself at considerable length as to his reasons for not going to Rome.[3]

1. I have for three years directed my defenders to appear there, and they have not been admitted to an examination, but have been cast into prison.

2. From Prague to Rome is, beyond comparison, farther than from Jerusalem to the Sea of Tiberias, whither Christ repaired.

3. Holy Scripture does not command to hunt anyone to Rome.

4. One finds there very little truth which accords with Holy Scripture.

5. I should have neglected my preaching office, without in the interval being able to accomplish any good.[4]

---

[1] "Sed nos secure cum nostra fide quocunque ire possumus." This sermon belongs, no doubt, to the time of Hus' absence from Prague, since Palecz would not otherwise venture to preach on account of the interdict.

[2] See *Doc.*, 192, 464. *Opera*, 334 *b*.

[3] Sermon on the Fourth Sunday in Lent, *l.c.*, 71.

[4] On the importance which, in this following Wiclif, he attached to the office of preaching, see his (Bohemian) sermons, *l.c.*, ii. 8: "And according to my judgment faithful deacons (assistant preachers) count for incomparably more in the Church than our prelates; for they discharge, properly speaking, the priestly office." Comp. *ib.*, 21, and elsewhere.

6. I should have uselessly consumed much of the alms, and so have deprived the poor of them.

7. My controversy is directed against the usages of the Pope, and particularly his authority, which has not been conferred upon him by God, but which he arrogates from the devil.

In compliance with a wish of the king Hus withdrew from Prague. "I have fled," he writes to the Praguers, "after the example of the Lord, that I may not afford to the bad an occasion for everlasting condemnation; to the good, a cause for suffering and distress; and, finally, that the fools may not shut up the services." "But when this interdict," he says in one of his sermons, "brought about great commotion among the populace, in that we were suffered neither to baptize nor to bury the dead, and on that account great disorders were to be feared, I withdrew a second time. Whether I did right or wrong in so acting, I hardly know; I would willingly withstand their interdict, but the people does not show enough courage to remain without the Pope's religion, to bury the dead wherever they can, and to baptize the children themselves."[1] In the accusations at the council, to be sure, it was said that he was expelled the city of Prague on account of impious opposition and disobedience.[2]

To the year 1412 belongs also the little treatise *De credere*,[3] which likewise is derived in by far the

[1] *Doc.*, 46. See also sermons in the Bohemian language (German, by Novotny), 56.

[2] *Docum.*, 203.

[3] *Opera*, i., fol. 169. See also below, p. 157.

greater part from Wiclif's tractate *De ecclesia.* As a whole we become conscious, from the beginning of the year 1412, of *a more intense study of particular tractates of Wiclif, and a more complete appropriation of the same;* as is clearly to be demonstrated from all the Latin writings of Hus, and even from those in the Czech language.

CHAPTER VIII.

HUS IN EXILE.—THE TRACTATE CONCERNING THE CHURCH.—ATTEMPTS AT UNION, AND EVENTUAL TRIUMPH OF WICLIFISM.

AT the moment when the deep-reaching religious movement was setting Prague and all Bohemia in a state of excitement, a helpless old man sat upon the throne of St. Adalbert. Weaker even than his predecessor, Albik did not even acquire the needed authority in his own house.[1] In the conflict of parties he wavered to and fro, and hailed with joy the opportunity when the exchange for a benefice relieved him of his burdensome and responsible post. He concluded a compact with the Bishop of Olmütz, by which he conceded to the latter his archbishopric, with the approval of the king and the Pope; for his own part he contented himself with the provostship at the Wissehrad, and received the title of a bishop of Neo-Cæsarea. As quickly as he could he forsook Prague, where he began, by degrees, to feel not at home.[2]

Konrad of Vechta, as is well known, after long

---

[1] Frind, *Kirchengesch. von Böhmen*, iii. 59.

[2] See the *Geschichtschr. der hus. Bewegung*, i. 77; ii. 62, and in particular Ludolph of Sagan, *l.c.*, 496—499.

hesitation, cast himself, in his latter days, into the arms of Husitism. On that account he has been treated with great disfavour by the Catholic chroniclers: "Even in his youth," they tell us, "but little that was good could be expected from this halting Konrad. The end of a man who could attain, by the force of money and flatteries, to the highest spiritual offices, could be no good one. Of this Konrad, forsooth, one might say with the Bible, 'He fell, and became lame.'" Konrad was inducted into his new office on the 17th July, 1413.

Meanwhile the king himself was endeavouring to compose at last the ecclesiastical differences. To this end, about Christmas 1412, he summoned the highest authorities of the kingdom to a consultation, to which, also, the bishops of Olmütz and Leitomisch were invited.[1] They resolved on assembling a national synod for the restoration of ecclesiastical peace. This assembly met in Prague on the 6th February, 1413. As well Hus as his antagonists laid their memorials before it.[2] Of essential interest is the judgment of the Prague theological faculty; for this it was which called forth, as a rejoinder, the well-known and most renowned of Hus' tractates, that *De ecclesia.* Hus indicates as the author of this, and a later judgment, Stanislas of Znaim; who, according to the former, composed by far the greater part of this "nonsense;" of a part he holds Palecz to be

[1] Palacky, *Gesch. von Böhmen*, iii. 1, 288.

[2] The mandate of Wenzel, as also that of Konrad, the administrator of the Diocese of Prague, see in *Documenta*, 473. The judgment of Hus, *ib.*, 52; of the theological faculty, 475; 480.

the originator.[1] In the introduction the memorial refers to the mandate of Wenzel of the 3rd January; then it proceeds to investigate the causes of the existing controversy, of which it specifies three:—

1. In opposition to the doctrines of the Church upon these points, the judgment adduces these: there are in Bohemia persons among the clergy who look upon the condemnation of the forty-five articles as unjust.

2. In farther opposition to the Church's doctrine, some of the Bohemian clergy, contemning the Pope and the cardinals, make Holy Scripture the only rule of faith, and without respect to the exposition of the wise in the fellowship of the Church, expound it as seems good to them.

3. In contradiction with the Church's doctrine, some members of the Bohemian clergy seek to stir up the faithful people against the prelates, and to the disdaining of the Pope, the bishops, and the ecclesiastical dignitaries in general.

The glory of Bohemia has always consisted in its orthodoxy. In order to efface the stain which has attached to it of late, we must command, under threat of the heaviest civil and ecclesiastical penalties, that no one believe and teach otherwise than is done by the Romish Church; that in all ecclesiastical questions the decision rest with the Apostolic See and the Church, and that obedience towards the spiritual superiors be observed. Accordingly, also, the articles of Wiclif, of which not one is catholic, but each is

[1] "Istæ nugæ processerunt secundum maiorem partem de capite Stanislai." *Opera*, 220*a*; comp. *ib.*, 226*a*.

heretical or erroneous, inciting, and of a nature to turn away from the true faith, must no longer be defended. In the matter of Hus, the decisions of the Church must be submitted to; it is not the business of the clergy in Prague to examine whether the excommunication of Hus was just or unjust.

This judgment was at once combated by Hus in a brief epistle, in which he rejected the assertion that there were heretics in Bohemia, and pointed to a series of inconsistencies in the judgment—of which the most considerable is, that Stanislas and Palecz pronounce the forty-five articles heretical, although they have themselves before now publicly defended some of them.[1]

As will be seen, the whole controversy turns once more, as at the beginning, on Wiclif's doctrines.

Along the same lines as the judgment of the theological faculty move the proposals of this body for the restoration of ecclesiastical unity.[2]

The proposals submitted by the friends of Hus[3] contained, as a primary condition, the demand that the arrangement concluded between Zbinco and Hus on the 6th July, 1411, should be upheld. Bohemia was to enjoy in its relations towards the Church the same immunities as other lands. The framer of the proposals, it will be seen at the first glance, has England in view. Approbations and condemnations were thus to be promulgated only with the permission of the civil authority. Hus was to be

[1] "Contra consilium doctorum." *Doc.* 53.
[2] *Ib.*, 486.
[3] "Condiciones concordiæ propositæ a Mag. J. Hus." *Doc.* 491.

permitted to defend himself at a synod against his opponents.[1] If no opponent should appear, then it was to be published by royal and archiepiscopal mandate that any opponents of Hus there may chance to be, present themselves against the same. And in the event of the opponents then failing to come forward, it be lawful to call upon those who made the notification to the Pope to name the heretics; if they are not able to do this, they are to be punished.

Like summonses were to be addressed also to the theologians and jurists of the university, as moreover to the members of the cathedral chapter; and if these too were unable to point out any one as a heretic, an official declaration is to be made thereof before a notary. The king is desired thereupon to forbid all further stigmatising as heretical; and to come to an understanding with the Curia, in the bringing about of which those who have damaged the fair fame of the land would have to restore the same again. The interdict on account of the presence of Hus was henceforth not any longer to be applied. Jacobell likewise delivered a judgment. He thought it must first be settled in principle what sort of a peace was wanted; whether a Christian one, resting on the basis of God's law, or a worldly one. Against the proposals of the theological faculty, finally, the Prague magisters, friends of Hus, handed in a presentment.[2] The Bishop John of

[1] "Sub pena talionis" is added to this condition.

[2] As the author of this presentment, John of Jesenitz is looked upon (see *Doc.* 495), who had likewise defended the cause of Hus on the 18th December, 1412. See *Opera*, i. 334 *b*.

Leitomischl handed in to the administrator, Konrad of Vechta, on the 10th February, 1413, a judgment, in which he insisted with the greatest rigour upon the maintenance of the papal sentence against Hus, and in particular he would have all preaching interdicted to Hus and his adherents; for these differences would not have been able to penetrate so deeply among the people if their subject-matter had not been made known to the same by the sermons. The true circulators of the errors were the Bohemian writings of Hus; these ought to be placed under an anathema, and their diffusers treated in a like manner. For the execution of these things a Vice-Chancellor ought to be appointed at the University of Prague, who should have with unsparing severity to search for the errors of magisters and scholars, and to punish the same. The presentment of Hus also he seeks to refute point by point. The latter is endeavouring by his proposals to detract from the supreme authority of the Pope, and to bring his affairs before the national authorities—that, in case they do not shield him against justice and Church, he may implicate them in his own cause. One recognises in these proposals[1] of the "iron" bishop the stamp of the most rigid enforcer of the curialistic system.

The synod was dissolved without being able to attain to any result.

Hus was making his abode at this time, and during the period immediately succeeding, for the

[1] "Joh. episcopi Lutomisslensis sentencia de concordiæ condicionibus." *Doc.*, 501.

greater part at Kozí hrádek, near Austi. From this point he kept up a lively correspondence. Most of his letters of this period are addressed to the rector of the university, Christian of Prachatitz, and treat in part of the urgent questions of the day. "The judgment of the theological faculty," he writes to Christian, "I would by God never accept, though I were standing at the stake which is prepared for me."[1] His relations to Palecz and Stanislas, the former as well as the later relations, stand forth clearly outlined in the letters. In some of these one meets with reminiscences of Wiclif, nay whole sentences from his works. One sees the tractate *De Ecclesia* formally arise. Most clearly are we able to witness this in letters 28 and 29. He has composed the tractate at the said castle of Kozí hrádek, where John of Austi has granted him an asylum. There he had beyond doubt at his disposal a collection of Wiclif's writings, and in particular those which have been employed with considerable verbal fidelity in the preparation of his tractate—which, after the precedent of Wiclif, he has entitled *De Ecclesia.*

That Hus' tractate "Of the Church" contains in its dogmatic portions hardly a line which does not proceed from Wiclif, will be proved in the second part of these studies.[2] While he accentuates single propositions from the judgment of the theological faculty, he combats them with Wiclif's arguments.

The tractate on the Church was, upon its com-

[1] *Doc.*, 55.
[2] See below, Book II., ch. i.-iii.

pletion, sent to Prague, and there widely circulated. On the 8th July, 1413, it obtained a public reading in the Bethlehem chapel.[1] In this chapel there was evolved a peculiar Wiclifian form of service. There were traced upon the walls the main propositions of Hus' dissertation *De sex Erroribus.* Of this dissertation certain chapters, as the first, *De Credere*, and the sixth, *De Simonia*, belong altogether to Wiclif.[2]

As regards, for the rest, this tractate on the Church, the further treatises of Hus against the writings of Stephen of Palecz, Stanislas of Znaim, and the eight doctors, stand in closest connection therewith. The enmity between Palecz and Hus assumed ever greater dimensions, and is now already outwardly manifested. As Palecz calls the adherents of Hus Quidamists, so the latter calls Palecz himself a liar (Fictor); for which, however, he manifested deep regret at the Council.

After the fruitless issue of the February synod, Wenzel appointed a commission of four persons—the former Archbishop, Albik, the magister Zdenko of Labun, the Wischehrad Dean Jacob, and the magister Christian of Prachatitz—that they might hold consultations for the restoration of the ecclesiastical peace.[3]

Before this commission both parties were to speak and reply. There appeared on the one side Peter of Znaim, Johannes Eliae, Stanislas of Znaim, and

[1] *Cod. un. Prag.* V.G. 11: "Tractatus . . . compilatus . . . quem pronunciaverunt publice in Bethlehem A.D. 1413, et finierunt eodem anno post feriam V. ante spiritum sanctum." *Conc. Prag.*, 110.

[2] *Opera*, fol. 192 *b*, ff. See below, Bk. II.

[3] Prok. not., *l.c.*, 28.

Stephen Palecz; on the other, John of Jesenitz, Jacoubek of Mies, and Simon of Tissnow, in the house of the university rector, Christian of Prachatitz. Each party engaged under a penalty of threescore thousand Prague groschen to accept the verdict of the tribunal of arbitrators. But the parties occupied an utterly different standpoint the one from the other. This is evident from those writings of Stephen of Palecz and Stanislas of Znaim which manifestly belong to this period, and called forth the above-mentioned rejoinders of Hus, wherein, to no less an extent than in the tractate on the Church, Wiclifian thoughts are present.

At the very first question put by Zdenko of Labun, as president, there was manifested a yawning gulf of opposition between the opinions. Zdenko asked whether the doctors would submit to the decision and judgment of the holy Roman Church, on the sacraments and the other points affecting the Roman Church and the catholic faith. Stanislas and his companions answered this question only conditionally in the affirmative. If, namely, *their* notion of the Church, whose head is the Pope, and whose body the cardinals, be accepted, they would; for only the utterances of *this* Church on the power of the keys, the sacraments, the censures and dispensations, are true and catholic; those of Wiclif on the other hand heretical and erroneous.[1]

[1] The Chronicle of the University affords exact data with regard to these proceedings. The tractate of Stanislas is given incorrectly in *Cochlæus*, p. 29*ff*; a tractate of Palecz bearing upon this point is found in the *Concilia Pragensia*, 99—110.

Jesenitz, on the opposite, emphasises the fact that he must first insist on the terms of union between Zbinco and Hus; the burning of Wiclif's books, and the condemnation of the forty-five articles which has lately taken place, are null and void; there is neither in Prague, nor in the kingdom of Bohemia at large, a clergy which holds heretical opinions on the sacraments of the Church and the power of the keys. The decisions and ordinances of the holy Church they have ever obeyed, and will also in future obey in all things, so far as a believing Christian is bound to obey. To that holy Roman Church, whose head is Christ, and of whom the Pope is the representative, they will yield subjection in every catholic and ecclesiastical matter; and in all negotiations and personal differences with the other party, and in particular as towards the doctors, will submit to the arbitrament of the mediators here present.

Hereupon Zdenko proclaimed: "Seeing that both parties have submitted to the decision of the universal Church, as becomes faithful Christians, both therefore on this point are one. Be it then announced, in the name of all, that neither party is permitted henceforth to wrong the other in word or writing."

On the following day the doctors declared that they felt compelled to protest against the addition, "so far as pious and faithful Christians are bound." The negotiations consequently fell through, and Wenzel showed himself so greatly exasperated with Stanislas of Znaim and his companions, Peter of Znaim, Johannes Eliae, and Stephen of Palecz, that he banished them the land, and deposed them from their offices and dignities. "They never visited

Prague any more until the death of the king," says the *University Chronicle*, "since they precipitated themselves into the penalty of exile."[1]

Stanislas of Znaim went into Moravia. He appears now as chaplain to the widow of Peter of Krawar, called of Plumnow; and has addressed a letter to her, wherein he admonishes her to persevere in the true faith. With great severity he denounces the forty-five articles of Wiclif, of which every one is heretical, erroneous, and perilous. By the books of Wiclif also he desires that she set no store; for in the same are found doctrines opposed to the holy catholic truth.[2] Still, as always, Wiclif is the point around which the whole turns,—the name of Hus is not so much as mentioned.

Stanislas further displayed during the last years of his life an extraordinarily abundant literary activity,[3] which up to the present moment has met with no corresponding recognition. He died at Neuhaus as he was on the point of setting out for

[1] *Chronicon Univ. Prag., l. c.*, 31.

[2] See the Appendix, No. IX.

[3] Having no regard to his philosophic writings, and taking into our account only the polemic ones, we shall find the following noteworthy: 1. Tractatus de sacramento altaris; 2. De corpore Christi; 3. Gaude Maria, a sermon directed against five articles of Wiclif, the same which Hus defended; 4. Contra 45 articulos Wiclif; 5. Replica contra opinionem et motiva Wiclefistarum; 6. Replicacio magistri Stanislai contra replicacionem magistri Johannis de Hussynecz; 7. De ecclesiatica unitate; 8. De potestate ecclesiastica; 9. Tractatus de ecclesia contra errores Hus; 10. De autoritate aliorum apostolorum; 11. Replicacio contra replicacionem Jessenitz. Even with these his activity in this province may be by no means exhausted; for here the MSS. have not been taken into account, which are to be found in the libraries of Prague and Breslau.

the council.[1] The labours of Stephen of Palecz during the next few years were not of less significance.[2] At the council he was counted among the most passionate accusers of Hus.

By the withdrawal of these representatives of the strictly Catholic tendency, the opposite party gained the ground altogether for themselves. In town and land everything now inclined to the side of Hussitism, and one comprehends the proud language of Hus at the Council of Constance; "Truly I have said it; freely I came here; and if I had not willed to come hither, not *that* king (Wenzel), and not *this* king here (Sigismund), would have been able to force me; for so numerous and so powerful are the Bohemian nobles who love me, that I should have been right well able to protect myself behind their castle walls."[3] In Prague itself the Catholic party received a heavy blow, when Wenzel, in October 1413, deprived them of their former ascendency, inasmuch as he appointed that in future nine Czechs, in addition to the nine Germans, should officiate as senators in the council-

[1] "Petri de Mladenowic Relatio," *Doc.*, 246: "Magister Stanislaus de Znoyma equitans in Bohemia in Nova domo apostemate percussus mortuus est."

[2] To his controversial writings against the Wiclifites belong: 1. Sermo contra articulos 13 et 24 Wiclefi; 2. Sermo contra quatuor articulos Hussitarum (belongs, as we learn from the title, to a later time); 3. Tractatus de Romana ecclesia; 4. De ecclesia sentencia doctorum; 5. Contra reprehensionem consilii octo doctorum; 6. Responsio contra quasdam replicaciones partis hussiticæ; 7. Utrum de necessitate salutis sit hominem confiteri solis presbyteris.

[3] *Docum magistri Joh. Hus*, 283: "Tot et tanti sunt domini in regno Bohemiæ, qui me diligunt, in quorum castris latere et occultari potuissem, quod nec ille rex nec iste me ad huc veniendum coegissent."

house of the Old Town. Here, too, accordingly, a mighty revolution was accomplished. How does an old Czech annalist still complain, when he is narrating the history of the year 1412: "And all the senators were at that time Germans. Even the armed ones they made exclusively of Germans; among the other inhabitants, too, there were many Germans."[1]

While these things were taking place at Prague, Hus was engaged partly in the composition of his controversial writings, partly in preaching to the people in the neighbourhood of Kozí hrádek. On this account he retained with unwonted vividness the memory of his pastoral labours there; and in this district arose, a few years later, the town of Tabor. Of the epistolary correspondence which he maintained in those days, the letter of the 1st July, 1413, is specially to be mentioned, wherein he vigorously defends his friend Jerome of Prague against the charges of the magister Johannes Sybort, who had accused him of the diffusion of heretical doctrines.[2]

From the country Hus repaired a few times to Prague, where, however, he stayed but a little while, and always incognito. Thus he went to Prague in the year 1414, to the Festival of Relics—an incident which it was thought good to note down in MSS.[3]

[1] *Geschichtschr. der hus. Beweg.*, iii. 233.

[2] The letter is to be found in a printed form in the *Geschichtschr der hus. Bewegung*, ii. 209, and from this in Palacky, *Documenta*, 63, 64; but there most incorrectly printed. Better readings are to be found in the *Cod. Univ. Prag.*, I. G. 11, of which Höfler also seems to have made use.

[3] *Cod. Un. Prag.*, X. H. 17: "Anno domini 1414 magister Johannes venit ad ostensionem reliquiarum" (20th April); see Tomek, *Dejepis Prahy*, iii. 548.

One will be able also from this trifling circumstance to estimate the position occupied by Hus in those days. In order to be nearer to his friends in Prague, he eventually quitted the region of Kozí hrádek, and removed to Krakowec, in the district of Rakonitz, a castle which belonged to one of his adherents, named Henry Lefl of Lazan. Here, too, he delighted to preach to the multitude which was found in the place, or in the adjacent villages and market-towns; so that here likewise his views and doctrines were firmly established. "Here he remained," as the Czechist chronicler says, "until such time as he went to Constance."[1]

[1] *SS. rer. Bohem.*, iii. 19: "Tu byl tak dlúho, az pak gel potom do Konstancie."

CHAPTER IX.

HUS AT CONSTANCE—CONDEMNATION OF WICLIFISM.

FOR upwards of a generation a schism, "the like of which was never before seen on earth,"[1] had rent the Catholic world into parties. One kingdom made war upon another, one province against a second, the clergy fought against the clergy, doctors against doctors, parents rose against the sons, and sons against the parents.[2]

All attempts hitherto made to put an end to the same, and to banish the causes which had produced it, had proved to be failures. To restore the unity of the Church, and bring about its reform—that was the thought which animated the best men of Christendom since the first decade of the fifteenth century. Contemporaries have bestowed abundant praise upon the endeavours, in particular, of King Sigismund, for effecting ecclesiastical unity and reform.[3] By ceaseless urging he had prevailed upon John XXIII. to

---

[1] "Factum est scisma a seculo incompertum." Ludolph of Sagan, *l.c.*, 404.

[2] "Surrexit regnum contra regnum, provincia contra provinciam, clerus contra clerum, doctores contra doctores, parentes in filios, et filii in parentes." *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*, 451.

call together a general council. The Pope issued from Lodi the bull in which the opening was fixed for 1st November, 1414, in Constance.

At this council the schism was to be terminated, and the great reform of the Church, for which men most deeply sighed, carried into effect. In the first consultations the speech turned mainly on these points. As related by a contemporary, Ludolph of Sagan, the putting away of heretical doctrines was likewise steadily contemplated from the very beginning.[1]

It was, moreover, to be expected that the Wiclif-Hussite business would be placed on the order of the day; and specially must Sigismund, the heir to the Bohemian crown, be concerned to remove the stain of heresy from the land of Bohemia. "For throughout the whole world resounded the rumour, the Bohemians are the sons of heretical baseness."[2] The universities in the empire and outside thereof told of the same. In Vienna and Paris there was but one voice on this subject. Hus himself raised passionate complaint in this respect in the forementioned letter to the professor at the Vienna university, John Sybort; and the rector of the Prague university, Michael of Malenicz, in a letter to the University of Vienna, loudly protests against the injustice done to the Prague scholars in thus render-

[1] "Congregavit autem id propter decreta Pisani concilii, in quo ex racionabilissimis causis ordinatum extitit, ut summus pontifex pro exterpandis heresibus, sectis, et erroribus . . . . generale debuit concilium celebrare."

[2] "Non potuit ex tunc per amplius latere eorum heresis, sed *totus mundus* intonuit: Bohemos esse filios heretice pravitatis." Ludolph of Sagan, *l.c.*, 433.

ing them suspected.[1] From Vienna, as complained by this rector, the accusations spread to Agram. From Paris the chancellor, John de Gerson, addressed a letter to the Archbishop of Prague, exhorting him to extirpate the heresy in the Prague diocese. "For many years now," writes Gerson, "the pernicious tares of the most diverse errors have been scattered in appalling multitudes within the diocese of Prague, errors which have their accursed origin in the books of John Wiclif, which are there defended with the most provoking effrontery." In the answer of 2nd August, Konrad of Vechta declares his perfect readiness to extirpate the errors "of that most pernicious arch-heretic John Wiclif."[2] "Of all the errors of Hus," writes Gerson, in a second letter to the archbishop, "that proposition—it notably came down from Wiclif—is the most perilous, that a man who is from eternity reprobate, or who is living in deadly sin, ought to have no dominion, jurisdiction, or authority over other Christian men." The cardinal, Simon of Rheims, too, complains in a letter to the Archbishop of Prague, "that that old enemy has attained to such power in the kingdom of Bohemia."

Sigismund was persuaded that the religious dissensions in Bohemia could be composed in a peaceful way.[3] Hus was counted a heretic only because he remained under the excommunication without freeing himself therefrom. Even in the last days only *the*

[1] *Doc.*, 512; l. 3 of the letter must read: "Iniurias . . . . sustulimus nulla monicione previa ex parte vestra vel eciam causa."

[2] *Doc.*, 524. The answer, *ib.* 526. The second letter of Gerson, 528.

[3] See on this matter the evidence of Berger, *l.c.*, 90.

name of Wiclif was mentioned, when, *e.g.*, as by Gerson, the heresies of Bohemia were spoken of. In case the king succeeded in bringing about the reconciliation of Hus, behind whom a powerful party was standing, to the Church, he might safely count upon the gratitude of all Bohemia. But for Hus, too, it must be a matter of great importance, that the outcry raised against the heresies prevailing in Bohemia should at last be silenced.

When, therefore, Sigismund despatched two Bohemian noblemen of those about him—John of Chlum and Wenzel of Duba, both admirers of Hus—to call upon him, in order to dissipate the evil report against himself and the kingdom, to present himself at Constance, Hus was ready without any lengthy delay to comply with this request.

Through Henry Lefl, of Lazan, as through others also, he received the communication that the king would obtain for him a sufficient hearing. It is said, likewise, that he received the assurance of return, unharmed, in the event of his not being able to acquiesce in the judgment of the council ; yet this is not probable.[1] Hus went first to Prague in order to procure some documents there ; by which his orthodoxy and blamelessness up to that time were to be proved, as would appear with a view to meet the demand of the king.

[1] As regards the question of a safe-conduct, see the detailed presentation of Berger, *l.c.*, 92. Sigismund can, as Berger proves, have promised nothing more than security and protection for the journey, and his interposition to obtain a public hearing. Even in this he had proceeded somewhat farther than was compatible with strict law. Comp. also Lechler, *l.c.*, ii., 189.

On the 27th of August the Provincial Synod was held ; on the preceding day Hus published, by handbills upon the walls, in the Bohemian and the German language,[1] that he was ready to defend his orthodoxy before the Archbishop and the Synod. If any one would accuse him of heresy, let the same prove his accusations, or suffer the punishment proposed against Hus himself. The Synod found a pretext for not admitting him to the assembly. Hus thereupon declares, by a notice publicly posted up, that no one has arisen against him ; he will repair to Constance, and whoever has to accuse him of any false doctrine may appear there. On the 30th August Jesenitz presented himself with a great number of witnesses before the inquisitor Nicholas, Bishop of Nazareth, and put the question whether any error or heresy of Hus was known to him, or whether anyone had charged him with an heretical doctrine. The inquisitor not only denied that either was the case, but wrote out a testimony, in which he declares that he has always found Hus a true and faithful Catholic.

A number of Bohemian barons presented a like question to the archbishop, at an assembly of the magnates of the kingdom, and the latter made declaration that he knew of no heresy of Hus',[2] only that the Pope had excommunicated him. Of this the nobles made report, on the 7th October, 1414, to the king, to whom Hus had appealed as early as the 1st September.[3] The answer which Hus re-

[1] Mladenowic Relacio, *Doc.* 238.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 239 ; comp. 531.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 531.

ceived to this letter on the 8th October testifies to the joy felt by the king at his intentions, and at the fact "that our nation, through the intervention of Hus, will stand cleared in regard to those things which are falsely imputed to it."[1] In accordance with the original intentions of the king, Hus was to have made the journey to Constance in his suite; Sigismund afterwards also thought that if this had been done, matters would have stood far better for the cause of Hus.[2] Hus received the safe conduct only on the 1st November, after he had already reached Constance. John of Chlum, Wenzel of Duba, and Henry of Chlum auf Latzenbock, had to provide for Hus' safety on the route and at the Council. First of all Hus set his house in order; his disciple Martin received a sealed letter—the testament of the master—with directions to open it when he should have received intelligence of his death.

On the 11th October Hus entered upon the journey. The route was through Bernau, Neustadt, Sulzbach, Herspruck, and Lauf, to Nuremberg, where he arrived on the 19th October. With joyful heart he writes to his friends of his journey's course; the Germans in every place came out to meet him in a friendly spirit; in Bernau the parish priest had entertained him at his house, and said that he had always been his friend. "Hitherto," writes Hus, "I have not observed any enemy. I confess that I have no worse foes than my countrymen in Bohemia." In reality

[1] *Doc.*, p. 533.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 612.

there was to be perceived in many places not only a manifold curiosity, but also a lively interest in his cause. In Nuremberg, Hus had the pleasure of seeing the burghers of the town on his side, in opposition to the priest of St. Sebald's. There he formed the resolve, instead of going to the king, to travel direct to Constance. On the 3rd November he reached his journey's end.[1]

Almost simultaneously with Hus there arrived in Constance Stephen of Palecz, who had already provided himself, while in Bohemia, with the necessary material for the charges against Hus.[2] Without loss of time he opened communications with Michael de Causis and Wenzel Tiem. On the very day after Hus' entry, one could read on the church towers at Constance, that Michael would appear against the heretic Hus and his adherents. Hus stands in fact at the beginning of his end.

To present the single phases of his trial does not enter into the design of this book. It remains only to consider to what extent it was Wiclif's doctrine which contributed to the condemnation of Hus.

Nothing can be more characteristic of the hopes which swelled his breast, than the fact that he thought of being allowed to deliver some prominent discourses before the assembled council. He believed he would be able to carry with him those men favourable to reform, who were to be found there. With that end in view he composed the discourses on the all-sufficiency of the law of Christ for the

[1] *Doc.*, p. 77.
[2] The "Depositiones testium contra Mag. Joh. Hus," *Doc.*, p. 174-185.

government of the Church, on his belief, and on peace. These discourses, we are told, were composed *before* his incarceration.[1] That is not all. These discourses are so strongly interpenetrated with Wiclif's views and opinions, they contain so many arguments drawn from Wiclif's tractates, they are in the doctrinal parts so strikingly and verbally in agreement with Wiclif's writings, that one cannot hesitate to believe that he composed these tractates at a time when Wiclif's dissertations were in abundant measure at his disposal. This could hardly, however, have been the case with him in Constance. We shall therefore be permitted to suppose that Hus put to paper during the last weeks of his stay in Bohemia, these tractates by which he wished in part also to manifest his orthodoxy. For the tractate *De fidei suæ elucidatione*, and still more so for the treatise *De pace*, he consulted in the most extensive manner Wiclif's sermons on the Gospels for the Sundays.[2]

It was thus essentially views and doctrinal sentiments of the English master, with which he hoped to produce an abiding impression upon the assembled fathers at the council.

Inasmuch as even the bull of convocation placed in prospect the occupation of the council with the heretical propositions of Wiclif,[3] so must also the Bohemian movement, and in the first line the writings of Hus, be affected by such proceedings.

Of all the tractates of Hus there is no single one

[1] Krummel, *l.c.*, p. 307.

[2] See below, Book II., chap. viii., where the details are furnished

[3] Von der Hardt, vol. i., p. 18.

so strongly pervaded with Wiclif's ideas, or, more strictly speaking, which was so verbally transferred from Wiclif, chapter by chapter, as the tractate on the Church. Hus, on this account, testified great sorrow, when he learnt that this tractate had been handed over to his opponents in Constance.[1]

In point of fact, those forty-two articles, compiled from the writings of Hus, and particularly from the tractate *De ecclesia*, by the commission appointed against him by John XXIII., lead back almost exclusively to Wiclif. Those which are drawn from the first chapters of this tractate are derived word for word from the tractate bearing the same title by Wiclif.

At the fifth plenary session of the council, on the 6th April, 1415, the examination of the affair of Wiclif was entrusted to the same commission as was charged with the proceedings against Hus. Lechler has rightly perceived in this a clear proof "that the council regarded the process against Hus and the question as to Wiclif as hanging together (*connex*) and inseparable."[2] At the eighth plenary session, on the 4th May, the verdict in regard to Wiclif was publicly read. Therein it was said that, in the present period, Johannes Wiclif has been the leader and prince in the conflict against the Church.[3] Wiclif's doctrine was condemned as heretical, erroneous, etc., and his writings consigned to the fire. His bones, in case they could be separated from those of other persons, were to be torn up from the ground, and

[1] *Doc.* p. 105.
[2] Lechler, *l.c.*, ii. 205.
[3] V. d. Hardt, iv. 150*ff.*

cast into an unconsecrated place. For Hus and his doctrine this incident was of the worst omen.

On the 5th June, 1415, Hus had his first public hearing. Those books which seemed to the council most dangerous, the book on the Church, that against Palecz and Stanislas,[1] were placed before Hus, with the question whether he acknowledged them as his. The examination was continued on the 7th and 8th June. On the 7th June an Englishman thought he saw standing before him "the very Wiclif," as he listened to the guarded answers of Hus.[2] What was constantly brought as a reproach against Hus, and what he just as steadfastly denied, was that he had preached and defended Wiclif's doctrine of the Supper; then that he had proclaimed from the chair and from the pulpit the forty-five articles of Wiclif; they reproached him finally with having expressed himself with loyalty and affection about Wiclif. The other reproaches, which were made against him on the 7th June, had respect to the affairs of the Prague university, his relations to the Bohemian clergy and the Bohemian nobles, and had thus nothing to do with Wiclif.

In the session of the 8th June—the third and last examination of Hus—thirty-nine propositions were publicly read, of which twenty-six were drawn from his tractate *De ecclesia*, seven from that against Palecz, and six from the writing against Stanislas.

[1] "Quorum certi (libri) ibidem post sunt combusti et presertim libellus de ecclesia et contra Palecz et Stanislaum." *Doc.*, 319.

[2] *Ibid.*, 277: "Expectetis, ipse loquitur cautulose sicut et Wiclef fecit."

They were compared with the text of his writings, and when passages were met with in his book which were displeasing to the audience, there d'Ailli, to be sure, turned to the king and the others, and exclaimed, "Lo, here it stands worse, more dangerous, and more erroneous than it has been extracted!" Of the thirty-nine articles which were submitted to the council, almost all, and indeed for the greater part with verbal fidelity, are to be traced back to Wiclif; so that John Stokes was entirely in the right when on this day he made the remark previously referred to, that Hus need not boast of these doctrines as his own property, inasmuch as they belong demonstrably to Wiclif.[1]

To how great an extent this corresponds to the actual state of the case is to be seen from a simple parallelising of the texts of Wiclif and Hus.[2]

---

[1] See above, Introduction, and p. 86.

[2] So, for example, the third of the twenty-nine propositions extracted from the tractate *De ecclesia* reads, "Præsciti non sunt partes ecclesiæ, cum nulla pars ab ea finaliter excidit, eo quod prædestinacionis caritas, que ipsam ligat, non excidit."

Wiclif, *De eccl.* 16 *a* and 12 *a*. *Cod. pal. Vind.* 3929.

"Manifestum videtur, quod nullus prescitus sit membrum illius ecclesie . . . non habebit prescitos sed solum predestinatos partes suas . . . sicut enim superfluitas procedit ex cibo et membris solidis, dum tamen non sit ex eis: sic purgamenta ecclesie procedunt ex ea, non tamen erant ex ea ut partes, cum nulla pars eius potest ab ea excidere."

Hus, *Opera*, fol. 203 *b*, 199 *b*.

"Secundo colligitur . . . quod nullus prescitus est membrum sanctæ matris ecclesiæ catholicæ . . . Ipsa non habebit alia membra post diem iudicii . . . sicut enim superfluitas procedit ex cibo et membris solidis, dum tamen non sit ex eis: sic purgamenta ecclesie scilicet præsciti procedunt ex ea, non tamen erant ex ea ut partes, cum nulla pars eius ab ea finaliter excidit"

One sees that Hus, in his text above, has added after ecclesiæ

And in this sense we must take the words of an Englishman, who most urgently called upon Hus to recant. "By my soul," he said, "if I were in your case I would abjure; for in England all the magisters, one after another, albeit very good men, when suspected of Wiclifism, abjured at the command of the archbishop."[1]

Notwithstanding all this the council did not attain to a perfectly clear perception of the true nature of the relations between Wiclif and Hus; for with the condemnation of Wiclif's doctrines, those of Hus—two or three points excepted—were already condemned. Hus certainly stood in a closer relation to Wiclif, as regards teaching and writings, than Jerome to Hus; and yet it was said at the council, when the conversation turned on Jerome, "With this Jerome we shall be able to finish in a day; there the matter is much simpler, for this Hus is the master and that Jerome the scholar."[2] The same line of action ought, strictly speaking, to have been followed in reference also to Hus.

After the examination of the 8th June, until the

---

the word catholicæ, as he has also added it on the marginal notes to the twenty-nine articles in Constance (see *Documenta*, 225). While referring the reader to other examples which follow below (Bk. II., ch. i.), we here content ourselves with giving a few specimens.

[1] "Quidam Anglicus dixit: Ego per conscientiam meam, si essem in casu vestro, vellem abiurare. Nam in Anglia omnes magistri valde boni viri, qui suspecti fuerunt de opinione Wicleff, omnes secundum ordinem ex mandato archiepiscopi abiuraverunt." Mlad., *Doc.*, 136.

[2] *Ib.*, 315: "Cum illo faciemus finem infra unum diem. Iam levius erit, quia ille est magister, denominantes magistrum Hus, et ille Hieronymus discipulus eius."

end of the month, repeated endeavours were put forth to induce Hus to make recantation. Hus declined all recantation. On the 18th June the articles were accurately formulated, so as to serve for the basis of the condemnation. Hus added to twenty-five of them certain remarks, partly explanatory, partly limitative.[1] On the 24th June his books were condemned to the fire. On the 1st July he handed in to the council an explanation, by which he approximated as nearly as seemed to him possible to the standpoint of the council.[2] An agreement was not, however, effected at this stage: undoubtedly his relation to Wiclif contributed to such result.[3] The trial of Hus entered upon its last phase. On the 6th July, about midday, this likewise was brought to a close.

Hus had always intensely longed to obtain the crown of martyrdom. In numerous passages of his letters and tractates he breathes the wish that it may be granted him to yield up his life for the truth.[4] His wish was now fulfilled. While by far the greater part of the Bohemian people had before been enthusiastically attached to Hus as their prophet and apostle,[5] he was now revered as a saint and martyr. On the highways and streets resounded the lament for "John Hus the martyr, who had shed his blood

[1] They are best given *Doc.* 225; comp. Nat. Alexander, *Hist. eccl.*, 158, where thirty articles are mentioned, because an additional one is inserted between articles 20 and 21.

[2] Berger, *l.c.*, 163.

[3] *Ibid.*, 165.

[4] Comp. *Doc.*, 31, 55; *Opera*, 292.

[5] Ludolph of Sagan, *l.c.*, 450: "Eorum eciam nonnulli potentes et magni se dolentes suos apostolos amisisse."

for the name of Christ."[1] The Bohemians, as we learn from a Silesian author of the period of the Hussite splendour, canonised Hus, and celebrated his festival with strictly prescribed ceremonies on the 6th of July.[2]

The death of Hus has also long covered his relation to Wiclif as with a veil. The flames which rose with mighty blaze from the pile at Constance on the 6th July, 1415, displayed to posterity the form of Hus in clearer illumination than that of his English colleague. Only deep in the background has been discerned since then likewise the shadow of that man for whose doctrine Hus went to the stake—John de Wiclif.

[1] "Enim vero non verentur in stratis canere de præfato Joanne Hus heretico: Hic est martyr, qui pro Christi nomine sanguinem suum fudit."

[2] Tempelfeld, *l.c.*, 11: "Bohemi Johannem Husz alias de Husnicz appellatum canonizaverunt eiusque festum die sexta mensis Juli solempniter celebrandum instituerunt." Comp. Palacky, *Urk. Beiträge*, i. 40: "Ceterum quia *comprobatæ sanctitatis* felicisque memoriæ virum mag. Johannem Hus, qui vita et moribus præcellenter vixit," as it reads in an official document of the people of Prague, of the 10th July, 1420.

BOOK II.

WICLIFISM IN THE WRITINGS OF HUS.

CHAPTER I.

THE FIRST THREE SECTIONS OF HUS' TRACTATE DE ECCLESIA AND THEIR SOURCE—THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE CHURCH.

AMONG all the writings of Hus, that "*Of the Church*" has always been esteemed the most important:[1] friends and foes alike, it has constantly inspired with deep respect. No less a person than Peter d' Ailli declared before the Council of Constance, that this tractate of Hus, by its immense abundance of proofs, combats the authority and plenary power of the Pope, no less than the Koran combats the catholic faith.[2] Even in our own day this tractate is from one standpoint called the "notorious" one.[3] Since, according to the statement of a Protestant Church historian, the same contains a summary of all his theological views, and particularly those bearing upon Church reformation,[4] it seems the most appropriate course, first of all, to subject this tractate to an examination touching its sources.

---

[1] Böhringer, *l.c.*, 307; Lechler, *l.c.*, ii., 185. Gerson's *Works*, ii., 901.
[3] Höfler, *Geschichtschr. der hus. Bewegung*, i., xxxv.
[4] Krummel, *l.c.*, 336.

To what circumstance it owes its origin has been already indicated: it was intended to refute the judgment of the doctors of the theological faculty in Prague, of the 6th February, 1413. In reality Hus cites this judgment and selects the most characteristic passages thereof, in order to combat them. As regards its plan, the tractate divides itself into two parts; of which the first treats of the idea of the Church, the head and the members thereof, the Pope and the power of the keys; the second draws the conclusions therefrom, in order presently to refute the judgment of the doctors.

The main stress consequently lies upon the first part. With this the following pages are occupied. The first three chapters treat of the idea of the Church. They are—to state the matter briefly in advance—taken over word for word from Wiclif's tractate bearing the same title. One will not see this relation appearing with special distinctness so early as in the introduction to the tractate. Yet even the introduction reminds of Wiclif in some of its turns of discourse; save that Hus expresses himself much more briefly, simply passes over single argumentations of Wiclif, and picks out only what is essential to his purpose:

Wiclif, *De ecclesia*. *Cod. pal. Vind.* 3929, fol. 1: "... Decet christianos cognoscere matrem suam, quomodo queso honoraret quis matrem illam primevam, sicut quilibet christianus tenetur sub pena dampnacionis ... nisi ipsam cognosceret..."

Hus, *De ecclesia*, fol. 196 *b*: "Cum quilibet viator debet fideliter credere ecclesiam sanctam catholicam, sicut debet diligere Jesum Christum dominum sponsum illius ecclesie et ipsam ecclesiam sponsam suam: Sed non diligit ipsam matrem spiritualem, nisi ipsam saltem per fidem cognoverit.

Ergo debet ipsam per fidem cognoscere et sic ipsam ut matrem precipuam honorare."

Wiclif first works out the thought that Christ is *ex fide* our Father; the Church, His bride, our mother; and that we have before all things to honour the father and mother: "Christus enim ex fide est pater noster et dicta ecclesia sponsa sua et autonomasice mater nostra. Illos autem parentes debemus primo omnium honorare. . . . . Adhibeamus" (he thus closes this train of reasoning) "ergo diligenciam, ut cognoscamus matrem nostram."

It will be seen from the passages adduced, how closely Hus has kept to that which was before him; and as Wiclif, in that which immediately follows, first says that the idea of the Church is to be diversely apprehended, so also Hus.

From Wiclif comes the explanation of the Church as the mystical body of Christ,[1] the declaration that under the name Church is also to be understood the edifice built,[2] etc.; in short, the whole contents of the first chapter in Hus' tractate *De Ecclesia* are derived from Wiclif, and to what extent the reason-

[1] Hus, *De eccl.*, cap. 1:
"Ecclesia autem sancta catholica id est universalis est omnium predestinatorum universitas . . Ipsa enim ecclesia sancta universalis est corpus Christi mysticum . . ."

[2] "Ecclesia significat domum dei sanctam ad hoc, ut in ea populus excolat deum suum . . ."

Wiclif, *De eccl.*, cap. 1:
"Quamvis autem ecclesia dicatur multipliciter in scriptura, suppono, quod in proposito sumatur pro famosiori scilicet congregacione omnium predestinatorum . . .

Oportet ipsam habere templum vel domum quam inhabitet . . ."

ing is, for the greater part verbally, taken over the following passages may bear witness:

Wiclif, *De eccl.*, cap. 1:

"Illa autem est sponsa Christi, de qua est processus Cantici canticorum, de qua loquitur scriptura Is. 61: Tamquam sponsam decoravit me corona. Hec eciam est mulier fortis, de qua patet Prov. 31. et corpus Christi mysticum, de quo 1 Cor. 12. Ista est Jerusalem mater nostra, templum domini regnum celorum et civitas regis magni, que tota inquit Augustinus Enchiridion 41 accipienda est non solum ex parte, qua peregrinatur in terra a solis ortu usque ad occasum laudans nomen domini et post captivitatem vetustatis cantans canticum novum, verum eciam que in celis semper, ex quo condita est, cohesit deo nec ullum malum sui casus experta est. Hec in sanctis angelis beata persistit et sue parti peregrinanti sicut oportet opitulatur, quia utraque una erit consorcio eternitatis et nunc est una vinculo caritatis. Hec est sancta ecclesia catholica, quam confitentur christiani immediate post fidem in spiritum sanctum propter tria: primo quia secundum Augustinum est summa creatura. Ideo immediate ponitur post trinitatem increatam. Secundo quia amore spiritus sancti Christo matrimonio perpetuo copulatur. Et tercio quia posita trinitate oportet ipsam habere templum vel domum quam inhabitet."

Hus, *Opera*, fol. 197 *a*:

"Illa igitur . . . est sponsa Christi, de qua est processus Cantici canticorum, de qua Isaia 61 dicit: Quasi sponsum decoratum corona . . . Hec est mulier fortis, cuius domestici vestiti sunt duplicibus Prov. 31 . . . .

". . . Ista est Jerusalem mater nostra, templum domini, regnum celorum et civitas regis magni, que tota inquit Augustinus Enchiridion 41 accipienda est non solum ex parte, qua peregrinatur a solis ortu usque ad occasum laudans nomen domini et post captivitatem vetustatis cantans canticum novum, verum eciam que in celis semper, ex quo condita est, cohesit deo nec ullum malum sui casus experta est. Hec in sanctis angelis beata persistit et sue parti peregrinanti sicut oportet opitulatur, quia enim, que una erit consorcio eternitatis et nunc una est vinculo caritatis . . . Hec est sancta ecclesia catholica, quam confitentur christiani immediate post fidem in spiritum sanctum perpetua [sic]: Primo quia secundum Augustinum . . . est summa creatura. Ideo immediate ponitur post trinitatem increatam. Secundo quia amore spiritus sancti Christo matrimonio perpetuo copulatur. Et tercio quia posita trinitate congruum est ipsam habere templum quod inhabitet.

Wiclif attaches certain consequences to his exposition of the idea of the Church. In the first place, that no vicar of Christ may assert that he is the head of the Church. Of this we shall have to speak again further on.

That which is further brought forward by Hus, in his first chapter, concerning the Church, is likewise entirely derived from Wiclif. Thus, *e.g.*, the testimony adduced in proof of the proposition: "Ecclesia autem sancta catholica, id est universalis, est omnium predestinatorum universitas, que est, omnes predestinati, presentes, preteriti, et futuri. Patet ista sentencia per beatum Augustinum. . . ."

Wiclif, *Cod. pal.* 3929, fol. 16 *a*:

"Recurrat . . . ecclesia, que peperit Abel, Enoch, Noe et Abraham, ipsa peperit Moysen et prophetas tempore posteriores ante domini adventum et que istos, ipsa et apostolos et martyres nostros et omnes bonos christianos, omnes enim peperit, qui diversis temporibus nati apparuerunt, sed societate unius populi continentur. Et tamquam eiusdem civitatis cives labores huius peregrinacionis experti sunt, quidam autem nunc experiuntur et usque in finem ceteri experientur. Et correspondenter loquitur de ecclesia malignancium. Que inquit peperit Caym, Cham, Ismahel et Esau, eadem ipsa peperit Dathan et alios in eodem populo similes, et que istos, eadem ipsa Iudam pseudoapostolos, Simonem magum et ceteros usque ad hec tem-

Hus, *De eccl.*, 1, fol. 196 *b*:

"... Reccurrat . . . ecclesia, que peperit Abel, Enoch, Noe et Abraham, ipsa peperit Moysen et prophetas tempore posteriores ante domini adventum et que istos, ipsa et apostolos et martyres nostros et omnes bonos christianos, omnes enim peperit, qui diversis temporibus nati apparuerunt, sed societate unius populi continentur. Et eiusdem civitatis cives labores huius peregrinacionis experti sunt et quidam nunc experiuntur et usque in finem ceteri experientur . . . Et correspondenter loquitur de ecclesia malignancium. Que inquit perperit Caim, Cham, Ismael et Esau, eadem ipsa peperit et Dathan et alios in eodem populo similes, et que istos, eadem ipsa Judam pseudoapostolos Simonem magum et ceteros usque ad hec tempora pseudochristianos perti-

pora pseudochristianos pertinaciter obduratos, sive sint permixti sive aperta precisione dissenciant . . ."

naciter obduratos, sive sint proximi in unitate sive aperta precisione dissenciant."

What Hus says in his first chapter of the Church as the vineyard of the Lord, is in substance taken from Wiclif, *De ecclesia*, cap. iv. (*Cod.* 3929, fol. 16). Of the ecclesia bonorum (*properly* sanctorum) and malignantium (see Hus, *De ecclesia* 1, fol. 196*b*), Wiclif speaks in that same work (fol. 11*a*, and following).

In the second chapter of his tractate, *De ecclesia*, Hus treats of the unity of the Church. The latter is divided into the triumphant, the militant, and the sleeping Church. That which he asserts of the unity and organisation of the Church is entirely derived from Wiclif (*De ecclesia*, cap. i). The arguments by which he establishes his position likewise proceed from that source. Compare :—

Wiclif, *l. c.*

"Secunda conclusio sequens ex quidditate matris ecclesie, quod tantum est una, sic quod non immediate ecclesie catholice demonstratur, sic eo ipso ecclesia universalis sive catholica ipsa continet in se omnes predestinatos, non est possibile, quod sit nisi una universalis ecclesia. Nam secundum philosophos universale est quoddam totum atque perfectum, cui nihil deest, unde sicut iuxta Aristotelem 1. de celo omnia primo super tria ponimus, sic non dicimus ecclesiam catholicam nisi que in se continet ista tria : partem in celo triumphantem, partem in purgatorio dormientem et partem in terris militantem.

Hus, *De ecclesia*, cap. ii., fol. 198*a*.

" . . . Sciendum est, quod ipsa sancta universalis ecclesia tripartitur scilicet in ecclesiam triumphantem militantem et dormientem . . .

" Et in figuram illius dicunt doctores hostiam vel sacramentum eukaristie dividi in tres partes: primam inmersam sacramento liquido dicunt signare ecclesiam triumphantem, que insorpta et inebriata est intuicione divine essencie, ut loquitur cap. Ecclesie Cant. 5. exhilarans cives et commensales suos. Inebriamini inquit carissimi.

" Due autem alie partes in manu domini et merito ecclesie expurgande signantur per illas duas partes, quas sacerdos tenet in manibus. Maior supposita signat ecclesiam militantem et minor innixa supposite signat ecclesiam in purgatorio expectantem. Ipsa enim innititur suffragiis militantis ecclesie et pro istis duabus partibus geminamus preces agno, qui est caput ecclesie, ut misereatur nobis. Sed pro tercia parte, ad cuius partem et requiem aspiramus, petimus, ut idem agnus triplicis nature donet finaliter nobis pacem. Et hinc u t o s t e n d i sponsus secundum humanitatem suam visitavit tria loca ecclesie, scilicet umbilicum nostre habitabilis triginta tribus annis in Judea et Jerusalem conversando, limbum in quo patres purgati sunt, morsellum sue ecclesie in anima extrahendo. Sed tercio finaliter ascendens in celum cepit captivitatem, quam post triumphum coronavit, ad dei dexteram collocando. Ista ergo est triplex pars universalis ecclesie sive

" . . . Et in signum huius . . . dicunt doctores sacramentum eucharistiae dividi in tres partes. Primam partem immersam sacramento liquido dicunt significare ecclesiam triumphantem, que absorpta et inebriata est intuicione divine essencie. Ut loquitur cap. Eccl. Cant. 5. cives suos et commensales exhilarans. Inebriamini inquit charissimi. Due autem alie partes in manu domini et merito ecclesie purgande significantur per illas duas partes, quas sacerdos tenet in manibus. Maior supposita signat ecclesiam militantem et minor innixa supposite signat ecclesiam in purgatorio expectantem. Ipsa enim innititur suffragiis militantis ecclesie et pro istis duabus partibus geminamus preces agno, qui est caput ecclesie, ut misereatur nobis. Sed pro tercia parte, ad cuius locum et requiem aspiramus, petimus, ut idem agnus triplicis nature donet finaliter nobis pacem. Et hinc Christus secundum suam humilitatem visitavit tria loca ecclesie, scilicet umbilicum nostre habitabilis triginta tribus annis in Judea et Jerusalem conversando, limbum in quo patres purgati sunt, morsellum sue ecclesie in anima extrahendo. Sed tercio finaliter ascendens in celum cepit captivitatem, quam post triumphum coronavit, ad dei dexteram collocando. Ista est ergo triplex pars unius universalis ecclesie sive catholice, licet

catholice, licet quotlibet sint particulares ecclesie . . . et hinc credo, quod in simbolo ecclesie confitetur se credere unam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam . . .''

quotlibet sint particulares ecclesie . . .

''Ex quo consequenter sequitur, quod non debent fideles in ecclesiam credere, cum non sit deus sed domus dei . . . sed debet credere ecclesiam catholicam esse sponsam domini Jesu Christi . . .''

Wiclif, *ib.*, cap. vi.

''Sed quoad secundum conceditur, quod ecclesia est virgo, cum sit sponsa virginis Jesu Christi, ex qua ut vera matre spiritualiter procreamur et sic castissima secundum se totam in patria.

''Hec tamen fornicando cum adulterante diabolo et sic membris eius multis criminibus parcialiter est corrupta, ut patet ex fide scripture Ez. 18. Verum tamen nunquam recipitur ut sponsa beatifice amplexanda in dextera in lecto sponsi, antequam fuerit pura virgo omnimode sine ruga. Christus enim est sponsus virginitatis . . .''

Hus, *De eccl.*, cap. ii., fol. 198.

''Ecclesia virgo sponsa Christi, ex qua ut vera matre spiritualiter generamur . . .

''Hec tamen fornicando (cum) adulterante diabolo et sic membris eius multis criminibus parcialiter est corrupta . . . Verum tamen nunquam recipitur ut sponsa amplexanda beatifice in dextra in lecto sponsi, antequam fuerit pura virgo omnimode sine ruga. Christus enim est sponsus virginitatis . . .''

Wiclif, *ib.*, cap. vi., fol. 24*b*.

''Caput ecclesie quando Christus incepit esse. Ad illud autem videtur dicendum iuxta sepe dicta, quod Christus in primo instanti mundi fuit sponsus ecclesie predestinacione. In confirmacione autem angelorum dedit dotem parti sponse sue et sic in confirmacione Abel iusti et aliorum sanctorum usque ad incarnacionem manente continue eadem desponsacione, cum cesar semper Augustus continue auget dotem. In

ib.

''. . . Fuit autem Christus in primo instanti mundi sponsus ecclesie predestinacione, in confirmacione autem angelorum dedit dotem parti sponse sue et sic in confirmacione Abel iusti et aliorum sanctorum usque ad incarnacionem manente continue eadem desponsacione . . .

''. . . In incarnacione vero fecit secundas nupcias cre-

incarnacione vero fecit secundas nupcias creando quandam reginam partem tocius ecclesie, que quadam proprietate dicitur ecclesia christiana. Tunc enim dux et legifer noster familiarius alloqueus sponsam suam, ut dicit apostolus Ebr. 1°. per assumpcionem humanitatis induit arma nostra et ut gigas superavit hostes ecclesie, redimens partem sponse incarceratam et docens aliam, quomodo sequeretur eius vestigia.

"Unde tota doctrina christiana stat in illa oracione ecclesie, qua rogamus sponsum per adventum eius in carnem, ut doceat nos terrena despicere et amare celestia, despicere id est in affeccione postponere."

ando quandum reginam partem tocius ecclesie, que quadam proprietate dicitur ecclesia christiana. Tunc enim dux et legislator noster familiarius alloquens sponsam suam, ut dicit apostolus Ebr. 1°. per assumpcionem humanitatis induit arma nostra et ut gigas superavit hostes ecclesie, et docet quomodo pars ecclesie ipsum ut sponsa zelotypa debet sequi.

"Unde tota doctrina christiana stat in illa oracione ecclesie, qua rogamus sponsum per adventum eius in carnem, ut doceat nos terrena despicere et amare celestia, despicere id est in affeccione postponere et amare super omnia sponsum Christum."

To a considerable extent analogous, although not in exactly the same language, are the arguments advanced by Hus, in the last paragraph of the second chapter, concerning the unity of the Church. The example there employed by him: "Expedit, ut unus homo moriatur," is met with also in Wiclif. The latter treats of this subject in a subsequent passage (fol. 16*b*).

That which is evidenced by Hus in the third chapter *De ecclesia*, partly also in the fourth, that a reprobate (præscitus) can be no member of the universal and holy mother Church, is found expounded much more at large in Wiclif's fourth chapter. We cite in this place only the leading key-words of Wiclif's tractate:—

1. Continui composicio.

2. Omnia, que fuerunt vel erunt, sunt tempore suo deo presencia.
3. Ecclesia sancta est omnes sancti preteriti et futuri.
4. Generacio duplex bona et prava.
5. Ecclesia dicitur vere et pretense.
6. Membrum ecclesie dupliciter dicitur.
7. Membrum ecclesie sancte est omnis existens in gracia.
8. Deus diligere non incipit vel cognoscere.
9. Christus quomodo diligit ecclesiam.
10. Odit Christus quemlibet prescitum.
11. Ecclesia sancta a quo incepit.
12. Ecclesia malignancium a quo incepit.
13. Generant boni bonos et mali malos.
14. Ecclesia sancta vinea est.
15. Prescitus non est membrum ecclesie.
16. Membrum ecclesie nemo debet asserere esse.
17. Membra ecclesie mali plus se esse asserunt quam boni.
18. Romana ecclesia vocatur uno modo sponsa Christi.
19. Ecclesie unitas unde capitur.
20. Ecclesia Romana non est iste papa cum cardinalibus.
21. Ecclesie Romane partes digniores papa, cardinales.
22. Ecclesia equivoce sumitur.
23. Esse in ecclesia est aliud quam esse de ecclesia.
24. Ecclesie noticie a fideli.

The course of the presentation is with Wiclif much more methodical and clear. Hus here only gives excerpts from Wiclif, and notably transposes several parts. The main question with Wiclif is the love of God, Who never begins to love. From this, then, follow all further deductions. Hus brings in this reasoning, word for word, in the middle of the fourth chapter. Elsewhere, too, he introduces numerous and lengthy passages of Wiclif into his argument, and has derived single particulars which are not found in Wiclif's tractate, *De ecclesia*, from other treatises. Thus, *e.g.*, that which he says under the title: "Quare Christus dicitur et est caput ecclesie," is taken from Wiclif, "De Christo et

adversario suo Antichristo." The passages in both chapters, which he borrows word for word, are :—

Wiclif, *Cod. Pal.* 3929, fol. 12 :

"Et[1] patet, quod non sequitur: Si quicunque viantes sunt in ecclesia, tunc sunt de ecclesia sed econtra. Nam scimus zizania crescere inter frumenta, corvum pasci in eadem area cum columba et paleam inhorreari pro tempore intergrana : et tamen est incommunicans distinccio inter ista, sicut exemplificatum est in corpore humano, imaginari debemus de sancta matre ecclesia et sic intelligendus est textus 1. Joh. 2°, cum dicitur: Nunc Antichristi multi facti sunt, ex nobis prodierunt sed non erant ex nobis. Nam si fuissent ex nobis, permansissent utique nobiscum. Sicut enim superfluitas procedit ex cibo et membris solidis, dum tamen non sit ex eis : sic purgamenta ecclesie procedunt ex ea, non tamen erant ex ea ut partes, cum nulla pars eius potest ab ea excidere . . ."

Hus, *Opera*, 199 *b.*; *De eccl.* 3 :

"Et patet, quod non sequitur: Si quicunque viantes sunt in ecclesia, tum sunt de ecclesia sed econtra. Nam scimus zizania crescere inter frumenta, corvum pascere in eadem area cum columba et paleam inhorreari inter grana: et tamen est incommunicans distinccio inter ista, sicut exemplificatum est in corpore humano. Ita imaginari debemus de sancta matre ecclesia et ad hec vadit textus 1. Joh. 2°, cum dicitur: Nunc Antichristi multi facti sunt, ex nobis prodierunt, sed non erant ex nobis. Nam si fuissent ex nobis, permansissent utique nobiscum. Sicut enim superfluitas procedit ex cibo et membris solidis, dum tamen non sit ex eis : sic purgamenta ecclesie scilicet praesciti procedunt ex ea, non tamen erant ex ea ut partes, cum nulla pars eius ab ea finaliter excidit . . ."

Ib., fol. 17 *b* :

"Quidam autem sunt in ecclesia nomine et re ut obedientes catholici, quidam nec re nec nomine ut pagani, quidam nomine tantum ut presciti hypocrite. Et quidam re, licet videantur, nomine esse

Ib., fol. 200 *a* :

"Quidam enim sunt in ecclesia nomine et re ut predestinati obedientes catholici Christo, quidam nec re nec nomine ut presciti pagani, quidam nomine tantum ut presciti hypocritae. Et qui-

[1] In Wiclif there appears, as a marginal note, the title "Esse in ecclesia est aliud quam esse de ecclesia sancta," which with Hus, *l.c.*, is adopted into the text itself.

fores ut predestinati, quos (Antichristi) satrape videntur in facie ecclesie condempnare. Ecce decretorum concordia . . ."

dam re, licet videantur nomine esse foris, ut predestinati christiani, quos Antichristi satrape videntur in facie ecclesiae condempnare . . ."

That which Hus sets forth under the title "Duplex gracia" is, as to the sense, likewise derived from Wiclif, *De ecclesia*, cap. 4 (fol. 14).

CHAPTER II.

THE SECTIONS CONCERNING THE HEAD AND THE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH IN HUS' TRACTATE ON THE CHURCH.

INASMUCH as the theologians in their judgment determined the idea of the Church in such wise that they said "the head of the Roman Church is the Pope, its body the college of the cardinals; these are the manifest and real successors of the Apostle-prince Peter and of the college of the other apostles of Christ,"[1] etc.; Hus seeks on the other hand to prove that Christ has been and is, from the beginning of the world to the consummation of all things, the Head of the Church, and all the righteous are members of His body. Those from eternity destined to condemnation were and are never members of this body. As, however, Christ is the head of the elect, so is the devil the head of the wicked. These things are handled in chapters iv.-vi. The expatiations are almost exclusively those of Wiclif, in his tractate *De*

[1] *Docum. mag. Hus*, p. 475: "Romane ecclesie papa est caput, corpus vero collegium cardinalium existentes manifesti et veri successores principis apostolorum Petri et collegii aliorum apostolorum Christi in officio ecclesiastico cognoscendi et diffiniendi universam materiam catholicam et ecclesiasticam." . . . .

ecclesia ; a few additional details only are to be met with in the dissertation *De fide catholica.*

From Wiclif, *De ecclesia*, cap. 1 (*l.c.*, fol. 3 *b*), is derived the second part of the first paragraph of cap. 4, *De ecclesia* : " Non potest esse biceps ecclesia." The first part, on the other hand, is derived in its entirety from Wiclif, *De Christo et suo adversario Antichristo* (p. 38).

Wiclif, *De eccl.* cap. 1, *l.c.*, fol. 3 *b* :

". . . Unde si aliquis christianus foret cum eo caput universalis ecclesie, cum ipsa non potest esse monstrum habens ex equo duo capita ut dicitur 2 q., oporteret concedere, quod est Christus vel aliter, quod Christus foret ipso inferior et humile membrum eius. Ideo apostoli confessi sunt concorditer se esse servos istius capitis et humiles ministros ecclesie sponse sue. Nunquam autem presumpsit aliquis apostolorum asserere, quod fuit caput vel sponsus dicte ecclesie, quia hoc foret antichristine adulterari cum regina celi, zelotipando dominum Jesum Christum, quod foret nimis grave, cum Exod. 20 vere dicitur: Quod ipse sit fortis zelotes. Et secunda pars patet ex hoc, quod caput est nomen dignitatis atque officii, dignitatis quoad predestinacionem eternam, qua Christus ordinavit prepositos, qui presunt secundum legem suam in ecclesia militante, habere mansiones superiores racione sui regiminis in ecclesia triumphante."

Opera, fol. 200 *b* :

" Ex quo patet, quod si aliquis christianus foret cum Christo caput universalis ecclesie, cum ipsa non potest esse monstrum, habens ex equo duo capita ut dicitur . . . oporteret concedere, quod ille Christianus, qui esset caput illius ecclesie, esset Christus vel aliter concedere, quod Christus foret ipso inferior et humile membrum eius . . . Unde sancti apostoli confessi sunt concorditer se esse servos istius capitis et humiles ministros ecclesie sponse sue. Nunquam autem presumpsit aliquis apostolorum asserere, quod fuit caput vel sponsus dicte ecclesie, quia hoc foret adulterari cum regina coeli et presumere nomen dignitatis et officii dignitatis, quoad predestinacionem eternam et officii, ad quod ex ordinacione eterna disposuit Deus Christum supreme regere sponsam suam . . ."

What Hus says of the "Caput ecclesie internum et externum" is derived in part from the fourth chapter of Wiclif, *De ecclesia*. The second part is derived altogether from Wiclif.

Wiclif, *De eccl.*, cap. ii., fol. 4 *b*:

". . . Idem corpus ecclesie habet multa capita subordinata, sicut idem populus habet multos dominos: unum subordinatum alteri, sicut patet in materia civili. Et sic videtur dicere, quod eadem ecclesia habet multa capita ordinata sed inferius atque superius. Hic dicitur, quod idem corpus ecclesie habet ad minimum tria capita scilicet divinitatem Christi, humanitatem et capitaneum illius ecclesie. Ecclesia autem universalis, que est totum corpus Christi misticum, habet duo capita scilicet caput extrinsecum, que est divinitas, et caput intrinsecum, que est Christi humanitas.

"Et modo ineffabili divinitas et humanitas Christi sunt duo capita tocius ecclesie et cum hoc eciam unum caput, sicut filius et spiritus sanctus sunt unus paraclitus. . . ."

Opera, 203 *a*:

"Unde patet, quod non repugnat particularem ecclesiam habere plura capita.

". . . Nam potest habere tria capita scilicet divinitatem Christi, humanitatem et capitaneum . . . Ecclesia autem universalis ut dictum est habet duo capita, unum extrinsecum, quod est divinitas et aliud intrinsecum, quod est humanitas."

Ibid., cap. 4, fol. 16 *a*:

". . . Manifestum videtur, quod nullus prescitus sit membrum illius ecclesie. Nam solum illa est mater ecclesia pro tempore vie, que coronabitur. Nec habebit hic alias partes quam habebit post diem iudicii, quando erit sine

Opera, fol. 203 *b*:

". . . Secundo . . . colligitur, quod nullus prescitus est membrum sancte matris ecclesie catholice. Nam solum unica est sancta mater ecclesia catholica a principio mundi . . . ipsa non habebit alia membra post diem iudicii

macula vel ruga. Non habebit prescitos sed solum predestinatos partes suas. . . .''

Ibid., 15 *b*:

''Nam impossibile est Christum unquam non diligere sponsam suam vel aliquam eius partem, cum necessario ipsam totam diligit ut se ipsum. Sed impossibile est, ut aliquem prescitum sic diligat, ergo impossibile est, ut aliquis prescitus sit membrum illius ecclesie. Pro probacione antecedentis suppono hoc famosum principium apud theologos, quod Deus non potest quidquam de novo cognoscere sive diligere. Patet per beatum Augustinum 6° de trinitate et 7°.

''. . . Ex istis videtur, quod Christus semper diligit totam ecclesiam ut se ipsum, quia aliquando sic diliget scilicet post diem iudicii, quando regnabit cum eo, ut patet ex processu Cantici canticorum. Aliter enim non foret verum matrimonium ex caritate perpetua Christi consencientis ad divinas nupcias, nisi sponsus, qui est una persona cum sponsa, ipsam diligat ut semet ipsum . . . et hinc Eph. v. dicitur: Viri diligite uxores vestras sicut Christus dilexit ecclesiam et semet ipsum tradidit pro ea, ut eam sanctificaret, mundans eam lavacro aque in verbo vite, ut ipse exhiberet gloriosam ecclesiam non habentem maculam aut rugam aut aliquid huiusmodi, ut sit sancta et immaculata . . .

quam habet et habebit ante diem iudicii. . . .''

Ibid., fol. 203 *b*:

''Item impossibile Christum unquam non diligere sponsam suam vel aliquam eius partem, cum necessario ipsam diligit ut se ipsum. Sed impossibile est, ut aliquem prescitum sic diligat, ergo impossibile est, ut aliquis prescitus sit membrum illius ecclesie. Antecedens patet per illud famosum principium, quod non potest Deus quidquam de novo cognoscere seu diligere, ut dicit Augustinus 6 de trinitate . . .

''Ex quo videtur, quod Christus diligit totam ecclesiam ut se ipsum, quia aliquando sic diliget scilicet post diem iudicii, quando regnabit cum eo, ut patet ex processu Cantici Cant. Aliter enim non foret verum matrimonium ex charitate perpetua Christi consencientis ad divinas nupcias, nisi sponsus, qui est una persona . . . ipsam diligat ut semet ipsum. Ad hoc enim dicit apostolus Eph. v. Christus dilexit ecclesiam et tradidit semet ipsum pro ea, ut eam sanctificaret, mundans eam lavacro aque in verbo vite, ut ipse sibi exhiberet gloriosam ecclesiam non habentem maculam aut rugam aut aliquid huiusmodi, ut sit sancta et immaculata . . .

"Ex ista fide scripture de sancta matre ecclesia patet . . . quod debet semper diligere totam sanctam ecclesiam sicut diliget post diem iudicii. Et per idem odit semper quemcunque prescitum sicut unquam post diem iudicii.

"Cum enim Deus plene scit, qualem finem quicunque prescitus cum ipso faciet et quantam penitenciam agent quicunque predestinati casuri postmodum perpetuo deo grati, patet quod necessario omnem predestinatum, quantumcunque criminosus fuerit, plus diligit quam aliquem prescitum, in quantacunque gracia fuerit temporali, quia (predestinatum) eternaliter vult habere beatitudinem et alium ignem perpetuum. Testatur autem scriptura, quod Deus odit peccatores ut patet Psalm. v. Odisti omnes, qui operantur iniquitatem." . . .

Ib., cap. i., fol. 1 *a b*:

"Ista autem ecclesia secundum partem peregrinantem non habet aliquem prescitum sed partem sui sicut non habet secundum partem triumphantem, dum est huiusmodi aliquem miserum vel quolibet maculatum. ut ostendit Augustinus 3° de doctrina christiana 32°, ubi postquam ostenderat, quod corpus Christi et caput eius Christus sunt una persona, increpat Tyconium in secunda sui (?) regula, qua vocat ecclesiam corpus domini bipartitum. Non inquit ita debuit appellare. Non enim revera corpus domini est, quod

"Et patet ex istis, quod Christus debet semper diligere sponsam suam sanctam ecclesiam, sicut diliget post diem iudicii et per idem odit quemcunque prescitum sicut unquam post diem iudicii.

"Cum enim Deus plene scit, qualem finem quicunque prescitus cum ipso faciet et quantam penitenciam facient quicunque predestinati casuri postmodum perpetuo deo grati, patet quod quemlibet predestinatum criminosum plus diligit quam aliquem prescitum, in quacunque gracia fuerit temporali, quia predestinatum vult habere perpetuam beatitudinem et prescitum vult habere ignem perpetuum. Ut patet in psalmo: Odisti omnes, qui operantur iniquitatem" . . .

Ib., fol. 203 *b*:

"Prescitus autem cum sit membrum diaboli non compaginatur ordinate huic capiti. Et ipse Augustinus . . . postquam ostendit, quod Christus et corpus suum, quod est ecclesia, sunt una persona, increpat Tyconium in secunda regula, qua vocat totum genus hominum corpus domini bipartitum. Non inquit debuit sic appellare. Non enim revera corpus domini est, quod cum ipso non erit in æternum . . ."

cum illo non manebit in eternum" . . .

The evidences which follow consist mainly of conclusions drawn from that which precedes, and like the latter are derived from Wiclif. In proof whereof only one more specimen need be marked out.

Wiclif, fol. 16 *b*:

"Ex istis sequitur . . . quod nimis magna foret presumpcio quemquam sine formidine vel revelacione asserere, quod sit membrum illius ecclesie. Nam nemo nisi predestinatus et sanctus tempore suo sine macula vel ruga est membrum illius ecclesie. Sed nemo sine formidine vel revelacione assereret, quod sit predestinatus et sanctus sine macula vel ruga. Ergo conclusio. Unde miror, qua fronte magis contendentes pro proprietate bonorum ecclesie magis seculariter viventes elongati a Christi conversacione et plus steriles ab execucione Christi consilii et precepti plus vendicant titulo participii illius ecclesie." . . .

Opera, 204 *b*:

"Ex quo patet, quod magna foret presumpcio, quenquam sine revelacione vel formidine asserere, quod ipse sit membrum illius sancte ecclesie. Nam nemo nisi predestinatus tempore suo sine macula vel ruga est membrum illius ecclesie. Sed nemo sine formidine vel revelacione assereret, quod ipse sit predestinatus ac sanctus sine macula vel ruga . . . Unde valde est mirabile, qua fronte magis seculo dediti magis seculariter et enormiter viventes elongati a Christi conversacione et plus steriles ab explecione Christi consilii et precepti sine formidine asserunt se fore capita vel corpus vel membra precipua ecclesie sponse Christi." . . .

Wiclif, *l. c.*, cap. iii :

"Sed redeundo ad difficultatem dimissam obicitur per sanctum Thomam de Christo, q. 8, artic. 3°, ubi dicit, quod Christus est caput omnium hominum tam fidelium, qui uniuntur sibi in actu per graciam, quam infidelium, qui sunt solum in potencia eius membra. Et post subdividit secundum predestinatos et

Hus, *De eccl.*, cap. vi., Opp. fol. 205 *b*:

"Sed obicitur per sanctum Thomam de Christo, ubi dicit, quod Christus est caput omnium hominum tam fidelium, qui uniuntur sibi in actu per graciam, quam infidelium, qui sunt solum in potencia eius membra. Et post subdividit secundum predestinatos et prescitos, qui recedentes ab hoc mundo totaliter desinunt

prescitos, qui recedentes ab hoc mundo totaliter desinunt esse membra Christi. Et probat hoc multiplici racione. Quantum ad hoc testimonium sancti Thome videtur mihi, quod equivocat vere dicendo, quod Christus secundum divinitatem est caput extrinsecum tocius humani generis, quod dici potest aggregative unum corpus naturale, cui eciam Christus benefaciat sicut et toti mundo. Secundum humanitatem cum virtute passionis Christi acquiritur quedam perfeccio secundaria toti mundo. Et sic secundum humanitatem beneficiat toti humano generi, cum punit omnes dampnatos vel ex infidelitate, ut eos, qui non crediderunt in dominum Jesum Christum vel ex desperacione, qua dimissa debuerunt celestibus aspirare vel tercio de iudicio temerario, quo dimisso debuerunt domino Jesu Christo caritative finaliter adherere."

Wiclif, *De ecclesia. Cod. Pal. Vindob.* 4527, fol. 115:

"Hic dicitur, quod ecclesia multis modis sumitur scilicet vere reputative. Nuncupative vocatur ecclesia prescitorum congregacio. Licet ex nudo errore viancium fuerit de sancta matre ecclesia reputata et isti multi secundum famam seculi vocantur ecclesie capita vel membra ecclesie, licet sint membra diaboli, quia ad tempus credunt vel et nunc et semper fuerint infideles. Et ita potest esse ecclesia esse membra Christi et solvit dicens: Quantum ad hoc testimonium sancti Thome videtur mihi, quod ipse equivocat vere dicendo, quod Christus secundum divinitatem est caput extrinsecum totius generis humani, quod potest dici aggregative unum corpus naturale, cui et Christus benefacit sicut et toti mundo. Secundum humanitatem cum virtute passionis Christi acquiritur quedam perfeccio secundaria toti mundo. Et sic secundum humanitatem benefacit toti humano generi, cum punit omnes damnatos vel ex infidelitate, ut eos, qui non crediderunt in dominum Jesum Christum vel ex desperacione, qua dimissa debuerunt celestibus aspirare vel tercio de iudicio temerario, quo dimisso debuerunt domino Jesu Christo caritative finaliter adherere."

Opera, i., 205 *a*; *De eccl.*, cap. v:

"Hic dicitur, quod ecclesia sumitur vere et reputative, vere ut dictum est pro predestinatis. Nuncupative vocatur ecclesia eciam prescitorum congregacio. Licet ex nudo errore viancium fuerit de sancta matre ecclesia reputata et sic multi secundum famam seculi vocantur ecclesie capita vel membra, licet secundum dei prescienciam sint membra diaboli, que ad tempus credunt et post rece-

malignancium inproprie vel ecclesia antichristi, licet nunquam fuerint de sancta matre ecclesia. Et sicut de sancta matre ecclesia possunt homines esse dupliciter vel pure ex gracia predestinacionis, a qua nemo potest excidere vel cum hoc ex presenti iusticia. Et patet solucio."

dunt vel eciam nunc et semper sunt infideles."

Fol. 200*a*:

"Et patet . . . quod dupliciter homines possunt esse de sancta matre ecclesia, quia secundum predestinacionem ad vitam eternam, quomodo omnes finaliter sancti sunt de sancta matre ecclesia vel secundum predestinacionem ad presentem iusticiam . . ."

"Nam gracia predestinacionis facit filios ecclesie, quam nemo potest perdere sed solum pro instanti sue incepcionis adquirere. Sed preter istam graciam predestinacionis est dare graciam vel caritatem adventiciam, que nunc accidit et nunc excidit, et prior gracia facit quodammodo infinitum perfecciorem hominem quam secunda. Ideo prior facit membrum ecclesie, sed secunda facit deo acceptos officiarios temporales . . .

"Sic Scarioth fuit simul in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam et nunquam de sancta matre ecclesia, cum defuit sibi quecunque virtus . . .

Opera, 200*a*:

"Et prima facit filios hereditatis eterne, a qua preordinatus non potest finaliter excidere, alia gracia est secundum presentem iusticiam, que nunc adest et alio tempore abest, quia nunc accidit et nunc excidit.

". . . Secunda facit deo acceptos officiales temporales.

"Unde videtur esse probabile, quod sicut Paulus fuit simul blasphemus . . .

"Et sic Scarioth licet fuit apostolus, quod est nomen officii nunquam tamen fuit de ecclesia, sicut Paulus nunquam fuit membrum diaboli, licet fecit quosdam actus actibus ecclesie malignancium consimiles sed in malicia

"Et sic Scarioth licet fuit apostolus vel episcopus a Christo electus, quod est nomen officii, nunquam tamen fuit pars sancte universalis ecclesie. Sicut Paulus nunquam fuit membrum diaboli, licet fecit quosdam actus ac-

quoad ipsum Paulum atque ecclesiam minores, nam in talia peccata dicit Augustinus, quod expedit predestinatos incidere. Et patet, quod duplex est divisio a sancta ecclesia, que heresis nominatur: Prima indeperdibilis, qualiter omnes presciti sunt divisi, et secunda deperdibilis, qualiter omnes heretici per peccatum deperdibile ab ecclesia sunt divisi. Et istam materiam cognoscerent tam fratres quam eorum discipuli . . ."

tibus ecclesie malignancium consimiles."

CHAPTER III.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE PAPACY AND OF THE POWER OF THE KEYS IN THE DISSERTATION CONCERNING THE CHURCH.

IN the seventh chapter Hus argues that the Pope, with the cardinals, forms not the whole body of the Church, but only a part. Not the Pope, but Christ, is the Head of the Church. The following chapter is occupied with the diverse definitions of faith, and determines what faith it is which constitutes the foundation of the Church. Almost all the material which Hus employs for his structure, as well as the idea of this structure itself, is derived from Wiclif, and indeed specifically from his tractate *De ecclesia*. The same applies also to the tenth chapter, in which Hus examines the question, What power is conferred upon Peter and the priests generally with the words, "Whatsoever ye shall have bound on earth," etc. In particular, the section of this chapter which deals with the power of the keys (*claves ecclesiæ*) is taken word for word from Wiclif's tractate *De ecclesia*. Let anyone compare :—

Wiclif, *De eccl.*, cap. i., fol. 3*b*:	*Opera*, 207*b*:
"Non enim est bona causa vocare matrem nostram Ro-	"Non enim est bona causa vocare matrem nostram Ro-

manam ecclesiam propter fastum aut complacenciam imperatoris dotantis ecclesiam nec propter extollenciam domini pape pompantis de parte imperii ex suo primatu sive dominio. Nec tertio ut credatur, quod ad ipsum oportet omnem christianum recurrere et de necessitate salutis ipsum capitalem recognoscere sed propter causas topicas supradictas. Cum enim Romana ecclesia sit terminus institutus preter fundacionem in scriptura sacra, satis est habere racionem probabilem, cavendo semper de deduccione perfida . . .

". . Quamvis enim ecclesia Christiana cepit a Judea et Christus caput ecclesie fuit martyrizatus in Jerusalem, tamen racionabiliter vocata est ecclesia Christi, secundum quandam preeminenciam Romana ecclesia propter tria. Primo quia Christus scivit gentes sub Romano imperio loco Iudeorum infideliter discredencium inserendas, sicut dicit apostolus Rom. 9. Secunda causa est, quia maior multitudo martyrum ibi triumphavit quam in alia civitate. Sic enim ubi homo nascitur ex utero et triumphat gloriose, nomen abhinc contrahit. Cum ergo parva ecclesia sancta secundum multos partes ibi nascebatur, segregata ex utero synagoge et ibi triumphavit crescens in gentibus, ideo fuit consonum, quod caperet nomen a civitate metropoli gencium, que est Roma. Tertia causa est, ut notescat,

manam ecclesiam propter fastum aut complacenciam imperatoris dotantis ecclesiam nec propter extollenciam domini pape pompantis de parte imperii ex suo primatu sive dominio. Nec tertio ut credatur, quod ad ipsum oportet omnem christianum recurrere et de necessitate salutis ipsum capitalem recognoscere et patrem sanctissimum sed propter causas alias. Cum enim Romana ecclesia sit terminus institutus preter fundacionem in scriptura sacra, satis est habere racionem probabilem . .

". . . Quamvis enim ecclesia Christiana cepit a Iudea et caput ecclesie Christus fuit martyrizatus in Jerusalem, tamen racionalibiter vocata est ecclesia Christi secundum quandam pre - eminenciam Romana ecclesia propter tria. Primo quia Christus scivit gentes sub Romano imperio loco Iudeorum infideliter discredencium inserendas, sicut dicit apostolus Rom. 9. Secunda causa est, quia maior multitudo martyrum ibi triumphavit quam in alia civitate. Sic enim ubi homo nascitur ex utero et triumphat gloriose, nomen abhinc contrahit. Cum ergo ecclesia sancta secundum multas partes suas in Roma nascebatur, aggregata ex utero synagoge et ibi triumphavit crescens in gentibus, ideo fuit consonum, quod caperet nomen a civitate metropoli gencium, que est Roma . . . Tertia causa est,

quod non locus sive antiquitas sed fides formata fundat Christi ecclesiam. Nam quoad personam et quoad tempus prius fuit ecclesia Christi in sedibus prioribus. Et ad istum sensum dicitur 2 Mach. 5., quod non locus gentem sed gens locum sanctificat. Et hinc credo derelictum licere vocare Chrisi ecclesiam nomine cuiuscunque loci, quem fideles iusti inhabitant. Sicut Christus vocatur Nazarenus propter concepcionem eius (que facta est in Nazareth), et potest vocari David Bethlehemita propter nativitatem et de aliis civitatibus, que possent licite dici sue propter inhabitacionem vel propter aliud factum notabile vel passionem."

ut notescat, quod non locus sive antiquitas sed fides formata fundat ecclesiam Christi. Nam quoad personam et quoad tempus prius fuit ecclesia Christi in sedibus prioribus. Et ad istum sensum dicitur 2. Mach. 5. Non propter locum gentem sed propter gentem locum dominus elegit. Et hinc credo derelictum licere vocare Christi ecclesiam nomine cuiuscunque loci, quem fideles iusti inhabitant. Sicut Christus vocatur Nazarenus propter concepcionem eius, que facta est in Nazareth et potest vocari Bethlehemita propter nativitatem et Capharnaumita propter miraculorum operacionem, que in Capharnaum patravit et Hierosolymita propter gloriosissimam passionem."

Wiclif, *De eccl.*, cap. xvii. :

"Et si queratur, quando regulariter incidit quis in infidelitatem, et quando remanet fidelis filius ecclesie, dicitur, quod tripliciter dicitur quis esse de ecclesia, sicut tripliciter dicitur esse ecclesia preter ecclesiam nuncupativam. Aliqua enim est convocacio fidelium secundum quid vel ad tempus vel nude secundum presentem iusticiam, et taliter sunt presciti de ecclesia pro tempore, quo sunt in gracia. Illa autem ecclesia non est corpus Christi nec ecclesia sancta catholica pars eius.

"Secundo sumitur ecclesia

Hus, *De ecclesia*, cap. vii. Opp. fol. 206*b*:

"Quantum ad primum, supponi potest ex declaratis superius, quod preter ecclesiam reputative vel nuncupative tripliciter dicitur ecclesia . . .

". . . Aliqua enim est congregacio vel convocacio fidelium secundum quid vel ad tempus vel nude secundum presentem iusticiam, et taliter sunt presciti de ecclesia pro tempore, quo sunt in gracia. Illa autem ecclesia non est corpus Christi mysticum nec ecclesia sancta catholica nec pars eius.

Secundo sumitur ecclesia

mixtim pro predestinatis et prescitis, dum sunt in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam. Et ista ecclesia communicat in parte sed non in toto cum ecclesia sancta Dei. Et ista ecclesia vocatur mixtim granum et palea, frumentum et zizania nec non et regnum celorum de quinque fatuis virginibus et quinque prudentibus . . . et istam ecclesiam vocavit Tyconius erronee corpus domini bipartitum . . . Sed tercio modo sumitur ecclesia pro convocacione predestinatorum, sive sint in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam sive non. Et isto modo ecclesia est articulus fidei, de quo loquitur apostolus Eph. 5°" . . .

mixtim pro predestinatis et prescitis, dum sunt in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam. Et ista ecclesia communicat in parte sed non in toto cum ecclesia sancta Dei. Et ista ecclesia vocatur mixtim granum et palea, frumentum et zizania, regnum celorum[1] . . .

". . . Et istam ecclesiam vocavit Tyconius erronee corpus domini bipertitum . . . Sed tertio modo sumitur ecclesia pro convocacione predestinatorum, sive sint in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam sive non. Et isto modo ecclesia est articulus fidei, de quo loquitur apostolus Eph. 5°" . . .

Wiclif, *De eccl.*, cap. iv., fol. 16 *b*:

"Et istam sentenciam . . . in decretum 21 dist. Quamvis universe per orbem catholice ecclesie unus thalamus sit Christi, tamen sancta Romana ecclesia catholica et apostolica multis synodicis institutis ceteris ecclesiis prelata est. Quod probat Math. xvi. Tu es Petrus, etc.

"Et illam ecclesiam vocat postmodum ecclesiam Romanam primam apostoli sedem non habentem maculam neque rugam. Ista ecclesia non potest intelligi duntaxat iste papa cum istis cardinalibus ac sua familia, cum ipsi cotidie recedunt et veniunt et

Opera, fol. 207 *a*:

". . . Unus thalamus sit Christi, tamen sancta Romana ecclesia catholica et apostolica multis synodicis institutis ceteris ecclesiis prelata est. Quod probat per illud Math. xvi.

"Et illam ecclesiam vocat postmodum ecclesiam Romanam primam apostoli sedem non habentem maculam neque rugam. Ista ecclesia non potest intelligi iste papa cum istis cardinalibus ac sua familia, cum ipsi communiter recedunt et veniunt. Unde

[1] The further examples are still the same, but given in a different order of succession.

crebrius quam alius fidelis populus sunt rugosi. Unde super isto textu dicit glossa: Argumentum inquit, quod ubicunque sunt boni, ibi est Romana ecclesia. Et hoc argumentum daret plenam fidem fidelibus et sic intelligo decretum 24 q. 1 A recta, ubi canon de Romana ecclesia sic loquitur: Hec est sancta et apostolica mater omnium ecclesiarum Christi ecclesia, que per dei omnipotentis graciam a tempore apostolice tradicionis nunquam errasse probatur nec hereticis succubuit, ubi notum est hoc non posse intelligi de quolibet papa et suis domesticis. Ideo glossa sic loquitur: Quero inquit, de qua ecclesia hic loquitur, quia non potest intelligi de papa, qui dicitur ecclesia, ut supra eodem quodcunque et 7 q. 1 Scire debes, sed certum est, quod papa errare potest ut 19 dist. Anastasius et 40 dist. Si papa.

"Ideo nec ipse nec eius familia est illa ecclesia, de qua hic dicitur, quod errare non potest. Unde ipsa congregacio fidelium dicitur hec ecclesia. Et sic intelligitur dictum beati Jeronymi positum 24 q, 1. Hec est fides. Sancta inquit est Romana ecclesia, que semper immaculata permansit domino providente et beato Petro apostolo opem ferente, in futurum manebit sine ulla hereticorum insultacione atque firma et immobilis omni tempore persistet. Hic non potest intelligi: Quicunque papa cum

super isto textu dicit glossa: Argumentum inquit, quod ubicunque sunt boni, ibi est Romana ecclesia. Et hoc argumentum daret plenam fidem fidelibus ad cognoscendum, ubi est Romana ecclesia. Et sic intelligitur decretum 24 q. 1 A recta, ubi canon de ecclesia Romana sic loquitur: Hec est sancta et apostolica mater ecclesiarum Christi ecclesia, que per dei omnipotentis graciam a tramite apostolice tradicionis nunquam errasse probatur nec hereticis novitatibus depravanda succubuit, ubi notum est hoc non posse intelligi de quolibet papa et suis domesticis. Ideo glossa sic loquitur: Quero ergo, de qua ecclesia intelligas, quod non possit errare. Sed certum est, quod papa errare potest, ut 19 dist. Athanasius et 40 dist. Si papa.

"Ideo nec ipse nec eius familia est illa ecclesia, de qua hic dicitur, quod errare non potest. Unde dicit glossa: Ipsa congregacio fidelium dicitur hec ecclesia. Et sic eciam intelligitur dictum b. Hieronymi positum 25, q. 1. Hec est fides. Sancta inquit est ecclesia Romana, que semper immaculata permansit providente domino et beato Petro apostolo opem ferente, in futurum manebit sine ulla hereticorum insultacione atque firma et immobilis omni tempore persistet. Hic non potest intelligi quilibet papa cum

suo collegio, illi enim sunt sepius maculati . . .

". . . Cum ergo iuxta decreta Romana ecclesia habet primatum et dignitatem quoad deum super omnes alias, patet, quod illa est totalis ecclesia militans, quam Deus plus diligit quam aliquam eius partem et sic manifeste sequitur ex fide, quod non id collegium sed tota mater in omni gente et lingua dispersa sit illa sancta Romana ecclesia, de qua iura loquuntur cum sanctis doctoribus. Unde ad imprimendum nobis istam sentenciam in cantu ecclesie per beatos Ambrosium et Augustinum composito mater nostra sic deum alloquitur: Te per orbem terrarum sancta confitetur ecclesia. Et in canone misse primo et principaliter offerimus pro sancta ecclesia catholica, ut Deus dignetur pacificare, custodire et adiuvare eam toto orbe terrarum. Unde non dubium oratur principalissima ecclesia militans, quam suppono esse Romanam ecclesiam. Verum tamen inter partes eius in comparacione ad quantitatem sunt papa et suum collegium pars precipua dignitate, dum tamen sequantur Christum propinquius et deserendo fastum atque primatum serviant matri sue efficacius atque humilius. Nam faciendo oppositum sunt nidus hereticorum, apostema putridum et idolum desolacionis cum aliis monstruosis nominibus in sacra pagina prophetatis."

suo collegio cardinalium. Illi enim sunt sepius maculati . .

". . . Cum ergo iuxta decreta Romana ecclesia habet primatum et dignitatem quoad deum super omnes alias, patet, quod illa est totalis ecclesia militans, quam Deus plus diligit quam aliam eius partem. Et sic manifeste sequitur ex fide, quod non illud collegium sed mater tota in omni gente et lingua dispersa sit illa sancta Romana ecclesia, de qua iura loquuntur cum sanctis doctoribus. Unde ad imprimendum nobis istam sentenciam per beatos Augustinum et Ambrosium ipsi ecclesie ordinatum est iste cantus: Te per orbem terrarum sancta confitetur ecclesia. Et in canone misse primo et principaliter offerimus pro sancta ecclesia catholica, ut Deus dignetur pacificare, custodire et adunare cum toto orbe terrarum. Unde non dubium oratur principalissima ecclesia militans, quam suppono esse Romanam ecclesiam. Verum tamen inter partes eius in comparacione maioritatis papa et suum collegium sunt pars precipua dignitate, dum tamen sequantur Christum propinquius et deserendo fastum et ambicionem primatus serviant matri sue efficacius atque humilius. Nam faciendo oppositum vertuntur in desolacionis idolum et in collegium contrarium humili collegio apostolorum et domini Jesu Christi."

For these portions Hus has drawn strongly on Wiclif's *Dialogus* also, which likewise may here be observed in a single example. Let anyone compare:

Dialog., *Cod pal. Vind.*, 3932, fol. 76*a*:

"... de fide catholica .. pro qua fidelis debet mortis periculo exponere vitam suam .. Et sic opinative potest homo credere bullis papalibus et specialiter si super illas rei experiencia addat opinionem, quia ille persone non faciunt fidem ... cum tam papa quam sua curia falli poterunt et fallere propter lucrum et ignoranciam veritatis."

Hus, *De eccl.*, cap. viii., fol. 209*a*:

"... pro qua veritate ... debet homo mortis periculo exponere vitam suam ... Et isto modo ... potest homo opinative credere bullis, quia tam papa quam sua curia potest falli propter ignoranciam veritatis. ... Fallit papam lucrum et fallitur propter ignoranciam."

From the same source is derived that which Hus brings forward in the eighth chapter, under the title, "Fides duplex." With Wiclif (*Cod.* 3932, fol. 77*a*) the title reads: "Fides duplex explicita et implicita." Let anyone compare herewith Hus, *l.c.*, fol. 209: "Et isto modo tenetur quilibet christianus credere *explicite* vel *implicite* omnem veritatem." We refrain from the citation of more lengthy passages, for this reason, that the agreement is not of the same verbal nature as above, and content ourselves with establishing the fact. As regards the employment of Wiclif's *De ecclesia*, one may compare further:

Wiclif, *De ecclesia*, cap. ii., fol. 8*a*:

"Sed constat ex dictis ..., quod fides nunc sumitur pro actu credendi, quo creditur, nunc pro habitu credendi, per quem creditur et nunc pro

Hus, *De eccl.* cap. viii., *Opera*, 208*ab*:

"... Notandum, quod fides nunc sumitur pro actu credendi, quo creditur, nunc pro habitu credendi, per quem creditur et nunc pro veritate, que

veritate, que creditur, ut docet Augustinus 13° de Trinitate cap. 2° et 3°.

"Secundo notandum, quod alia est fides, que est credulitas fidelis explicita et alia fides implicita, ut catholicus habens habitum fidei infusum vel acquisitum explicite credit ecclesiam catholicam in communi et in illa fide communi credit implicite vel confuse quodcunque singulariter contentum sub sancta matre ecclesia, sicut logici vere dicunt, quod sciendo ens esse in suo analogo sciunt omnia et singula in communi. Sicut sepe dixi, si quicunque christianus habuerit fidem caritate formatam in quantumcunque communi, sufficit cum virtute perseverancie ad salutem. Deus enim, qui dedit primam fidem, dabit clariorem, nisi fidelis ponat obicem. Non enim exigit Deus, ut omnes filii sui pro omni viacione sua cogitent continue in actu particulari de qualibet fidei particula, sed satis est, quod postposita desidia habeant fidem in habitu formatam."

creditur, ut docet Augustinus . . .

"Secundo notandum, quod alia est fides, que est credulitas fidelis explicita et alia fides implicita, ut catholicus habens habitum fidei infusum vel acquisitum explicite, credit ecclesiam catholicam in communi, et in illa fide communi credit implicite quodcunque singulariter contentum sub sancta matre ecclesia . . .

". . . Unde quicunque habuerit fidem charitate formatam in communi, sufficit cum virtute perseverancie ad salutem. Deus enim, qui dedit primam fidem, dabit militi suo clariorem, nisi ponat obicem. Non enim exigit Deus, ut omnes filii sui sint continue pro viacione sua in actu cogitandi particulari de qualibet fidei particula, sed satis est, quod postposita desidia habeant fidem in habitu formatam."

In chapters ix.-xxiii. of his tractate on the Church, Hus wages his actual polemic against Stanislas of Znaim and Stephen of Palecz. The discussions which lie at the foundation of the whole, such as the defining of the idea and organisation of the Church, the unity and the Head thereof, and thence the conclusion that the Pope and cardinals did not constitute the whole body of the Church universal, but Christ is to be regarded as the Head of the same; these, almost without exception, as has already become

apparent as the result of previous observations, he derived from the tractate of Wiclif concerning the Church. Seeing that Wiclif has expounded his doctrine of predestination in other tractates also, there cannot fail to be discovered a correspondence, pretty much of a verbal exactness, between different passages from the first nine chapters of Hus' tractate "Of the Church," and different passages in Wiclif's *Trialogus, de Christo et suo adversario*, and others. For the subsequent chapters, in which the polemic against the papacy occupies a wide place, Hus has of course employed to a much greater extent that tractate of Wiclif, which is in like manner directed against the papacy, "De Christo et suo adversario."

Nevertheless there is to be found in the subsequent chapters also a whole series of passages which have been adopted from Wiclif's tractate on the Church; in such wise that Hus' tractate on the Church appears as a faint impression of the other, wherein only the polemical observations against Hus' Bohemian opponents make any claim to originality. In other respects it is, from the first line to the last, the property of the English reformer.

Of the passages which Hus has further borrowed in this tractate from Wiclif's writing bearing the same title, the following, lastly, may be cited :—

Wiclif, *De eccl.*, cap. i., fol. 3*a*.	Hus, *De eccl.*, cap. xii., fol. 218*b*.
"Romanus pontifex Christus.	"Solus Christus est verus Romanus pontifex.
"Subesse Romano pontifici omni humane creature est de necessitate salutis. Patet ex hoc, quod nemo potest salvari, nisi meritorie subsit Christo,	"Subesse Romano pontifici omni humane creature est de necessitate salutis. Patet ex hoc, quod nemo potest salvari nisi meritorie subsit Christo,

sed ipse est Romanus pontifex, sicut est caput universalis ac cuiuslibet particularis ecclesie. Ergo conclusio."

sed ipse est Romanus pontifex, sicut est caput universalis ac cuiuslibet particularis ecclesie. Ergo conclusio vera."

Hus, *De ecclesia*, cap. xiii. (*Opera*, 221*b*): "Papa non est caput ecclesie" is, from "dignitatis quoad predestinacionem," taken from Wiclif, *De eccl.*, *l.c.*, fol. 16, yet not quite word for word.

Wiclif, *De eccl.*, cap. i., fol. 4*a*.

"Insuper si respicimus ad sensum et motum, quos in subditos influimus et ex alio latere ad speculum scripture, . . . eligeremus pocius vocari servi et ministri ecclesie quam capita, . . . quia secundum Augustinum in libello suo de decem chordis maritus perversus non est caput uxoris sue, multo magis prepositus ecclesie, qui pure haberet a Deo dignitatem huiusmodi, si a Christo degenerat, (non est caput illius particularis ecclesie.)[1]

"Unde postquam Augustinus ostenderat, quod femina vere christiana debet dolere de fornicacione viri non propter carnem sed propter caritatem et castitatem debitam viro Christo, dicit consequenter, quod Christus loquitur in cordibus feminarum bonarum, ubi vir non audit, dicens: dole de viri tui iniuriis sed noli imitari, quin pocius ipse te imitetur in bono. Nam in eo, quod male facit, noli eum putare caput tuum sed me Deum, et probat hoc debere

Hus, *l.c.*

"Item si inspicimus ad sensum et motum, quos in subditos influimus et ex alio latere ad speculum scripture . . . eligeremus pocius vocari servi et ministri quam capita . . . quia secundum Augustinum in libello de decem chordis maritus perversus non est caput uxoris sue, multo magis prepositus ecclesie, qui pure haberet a Deo dignitatem huiusmodi, si a Christo degenerat, non est caput illius particularis ecclesie.

"Unde postquam Augustinus ostenderat, quod femina vere christiana debet dolere de fornicacione viri non propter carnem, sed propter caritatem et castitatem debitam viro Christo, dicit consequenter, quod Christus loquitur in cordibus feminarum bonarum, ubi vir non audit, dicens: dole de viri tui iniuriis sed noli imitari, quin pocius ipse te imitetur in bono. Nam in eo, quod male facit, noli eum putare caput tuum, sed me Deum tuum, et probat hoc

[1] The words enclosed in brackets are wanting in the MS.

fieri. Si inquit in hoc, quod male facit, caput est et consecuturum est caput suum, eunt ambo in precipicium. Ut autem christianus non sequatur malum caput suum, teneat se ad caput ecclesie Christum, hinc debens castitatem suam, hinc deferens honorem suum, absens sit vir privatus, presens sit vir matri ecclesie coniugatus."

debere fieri. Si inquit in hoc, quod male facit, caput est et secuturum est corpus caput suum, eunt ambo in precipicium. Ut autem christianus non sequatur malum caput suum, teneat se ad caput ecclesie Christum, hinc debens castitatem suam, hinc deferens honorem suum, absens sit vir privatus, presens sit vir matri ecclesie copulatus."

In chapter xiv. the two sections, "Petrus fuit typus bonorum episcoporum, Iudas malorum," and "Pape vicarii Scariothis," are modelled after Wiclif, *De eccl.*, cap. xviii.

CHAPTER IV.

OTHER SOURCES OF THE TRACTATE "DE ECCLESIA," AND OF THE TRACTATES AGAINST PALECZ, STANISLAS OF ZNAIM, AND THE EIGHT DOCTORS.

IN the treatises against Stanislas and Palecz we recognise divers views which Hus has already stated in his tractate on the Church. It appears thus needless to return to these matters. From the foregoing chapters it is evident that, in the composition of his tractate on the Church, Hus consulted in the first line the tractate of Wiclif bearing the same name, and then also the Dialogue. There first of all comes under consideration Wiclif's tractate, *De Christo et suo adversario Antichristo*, the single parts of which, without exception, we shall recognise in the above-mentioned writings of Hus. They are, however, in many cases, employed without that exact verbal correspondence which can be shown to exist in the first chapters with Wiclif's tractate, *De ecclesia*. Often Hus only takes over one or other of Wiclif's thoughts into his presentation, yet it will be observed that even here these thoughts are reproduced altogether in Wiclif's words.

For the first chapters of his dissertation on the Church, Hus had no necessity for availing himself of

Wiclif's arguments in the tractate *De Christo.* If, nevertheless, there are to be found there certain propositions which are also to be met with in the said dissertation of Wiclif, this is to be explained simply from the fact that Wiclif has treated of particular points, as the idea of the Church, etc., in several dissertations. With certainty the employment of Wiclif's tractate *De Christo et suo adversario Antichristo* may be indicated as beginning with the third chapter. Compare—

Cap. v., p. 39 (ed. Buddensieg).

"Et incipiendo a radice supponendum est, ut fides, quod Christus sit caput illius ecclesie, ut sepe dicit apostolus. Sed de primatu apostolorum est apud modernos dissensio. Primo videndum est, utrum fundari posset in fide scripture, quod Petrus fuit caput ecclesie. Et videtur quod non, quia de ratione capitis est conferre omnibus membris sui corporis sue ecclesie motum et sensum. Sed Petrus nec contulit nec conferre potuit omnibus membris corporis sue ecclesie motum et sensum, ad propositum ergo Petrus non fuit caput sue ecclesie.

"Sensus enim non est pertinens isti proposito nisi sapientia legis domini ad viandum. Et illum sensum servavit Deus ut sibi proprium, licet occasione doctorum fidelium eciam cuilibet creature possit Deus doctrinam suam imprimere . . . . In cuius signum

Hus, *De ecclesia.*

Caput iii., fol. 199 (ed. 1558).

"Ulterius notandum, quod Christus dicitur caput ecclesie, ideo quia est persona dignissima in humano genere conferens omnibus membris eius motum et sensum. Sicut enim in homine caput est pars eius prestantissima conferens ipsius scilicet hominis corpori et partibus eius motum et sensum, sine quo nec corpus nec aliquod membrum eius potest notabiliter ex natura vivere: Sic Christus est persona . . . conferens vitam spiritualem et motum ipsi ecclesie cuilibet membro eius, sine enim influxu non potest vivere nec sentire.

Pro istorum . . . intelli-

apostolus, qui fuit vas eleccionis,[1] thesauri divine sapiencie constitutus sepe vocat Christum caput ecclesie et numquam in fide scripture vocatur caput ecclesie aliquis christianus . . .

"Et quantum ad tria nomina Petri, patet secundum interpretacionem Hieronymi, quod non sonant, quod Petrus sit caput ecclesie alicuius. Petrus enim dicitur agnoscens sive discalcians, Simon autem dicitur obediens, ponens tristiciam vel auditor meroris. Cephas vero est nomen tercium a Christo sibi impositum, et ipsum interpretatur potens vel firmitas, et est nomen Syrum non Hebreum. Sed rogo: quid sonat interpretacio alicuius istorum nominum, ut Petrus sit caput ecclesie? . . .

"Si igitur Augustinus timuit vocare Christum hominem dominicum ex hoc, quod eius sensus non est patulus ex scriptura, quanto magis timendum est aliquem christianum vocare caput ecclesie, ne forte blasphemetur in Christum, cui hoc nomen ex trinitatis concilio tamquam sibi proprium est servatum?"

gencia oportet supponi ex apostoli dictis, quod Christus est caput universalis ecclesie. Patet ista supposicio ex illo dicto apostoli Ephes. 1, Ipsum dedit caput super omnem ecclesiam, que est corpus ipsius" . . .

Hus, *De ecclesia*, cap. ix., fol. 212:

". . . Unde racione tam firme et profunde confessionis vocatur Cephas, quod interpretatur Petrus unde Hieronymus peritus linguarum dicit, quod Cephas interpretatur Petrus vel firmitas et Syrum et non Hebreum . . .

". . . Non enim Cephas id est caput interpretatur evangelium et Hieronymus, sed Cephas, quod interpretatur Petrus."

"Cap. xiv., fol. 222 *a*:

"Et pensare deberemus, quomodo ipse beatus Augustinus timuit Christum vocare hominem dominicum ex eo, quod eius sensus non patet ex scriptura. Tanto magis timendum est aliquem christianum vocare caput sancte militantis ecclesie, ne forte blasphemetur Christus, cui hoc nomen ex trinitatis concilio tamquam sibi proprium est servatum."

[1] The above form of expression, employed by Wiclif, see also with Hus, *De eccl.*, cap. ix.: "Ecce iste apostolus, qui fuit vas eleccionis." . . .

Wiclif, *De Christo*, cap. ix.:

"Similiter ecclesia Christi posset regulari prospere et quiete sine tali papa, ut patet de tempore ab ascensione usque ad dotacionem ecclesie . . ."

Hus, *De ecclesia*, cap. ix., fol. 283 *a*:

"Ecclesiam posse regi sine papa et cardinalibus . . .

". . . ecclesie, que potest eque bene regi a sanctis sacerdotibus . . . sicut regebatur per trecentos annos . . ."

A thought to which Wiclif also gave expression in the *Trialogus* (426):

"Debemus enim credere . . . quod nullus talis papa necessarius est per ordinacionem Christi . . ."

"Hus, *ib.*, fol. 283 *b*:

"Sicut ergo apostoli et fideles sacerdotes domini strenue in necessariis ad salutem regularunt ecclesiam, antequam pape officium erat introductum, sic facerent deficiente per summe possibile papa usque ad diem iudicii."

On the equalising of the single apostles:

Wiclif, *De Christo*, cap. vi.:

"Sed antequam ulterius procedatur, videtur dicendum, quid in isto puncto proposito sit credendum. Videtur autem probabile, quod omnibus apostolis Christus dedit plenitudinem potestatis ad ligandum et solvendum et faciendum quodcunque prelati officium in ecclesia militante, ut plane dicitur Math. 18°. et Ioh. 20.

"Aliter enim non fuisset Christus providus mittendo illos apostolos sic solitarie ad tam separatas provincias regulandum.

"Non enim consuluerunt

Hus, *Ad scripta Stanislai. Opera*, i. 276 *b*:

"Unde magis probabile videtur, quod omnibus apostolis Christus dedit plenitudinem potestatis ad ligandum et solvendum et faciendum quodcunque spirituale prelati ministerium in ecclesia militante, ut plane docetur Math. 18 . . . et Ioh. 20. Unde nisi salvator dedisset . . . plenitudinem, non videretur esse providus mittendo ipsos sic solitarie ad tam distantes provincias regulandum.

"Non enim consuluerunt

ceteri apostoli ex suis provinciis sanctum Petrum ac si ab illo papalis potestas necessario emanaret. Sed Paulus dicit signanter, quod illi, qui videbantur esse aliquid et columpne ecclesie, nichil sibi contulerunt, ut patet Galat. 2°. Deus inquit personam hominis non accipit. Michi enim, qui videbantur esse aliquid, nichil contulerunt, sed econtra cum vidissent, quod creditum et michi ewangelium prepucii sicut et Petro circumcisionis, qui enim operatus est Petro in apostolatu circumcisionis, operatus est michi inter gentes. Et cum cognovissent graciam dei, que data est michi, Iacobus et Cephas et Iohannes, qui videbantur esse columpne, dextras dederunt michi et Barnabe societatis, ut nos inter gentes, ipsi autem in circumcisione, tantum ut pauperum memores essemus, quod eciam sollicitus fui, hoc ipsum facere.

"Cum autem venisset Cephas Antiochiam, in faciem ei restiti, quia reprehensibilis erat.

"Prius enim, quam venirent quidam ab Iacobo, cum gentibus edebat, cum autem venissent, subtrahebat et segregabat se timens eos, qui ex circumcisione erant, et simulacioni eius consenserunt ceteri Iudei, ita ut et Barnabas duceretur ab eis in illam simulacionem. Sed cum vidissem, quod non recte ambularent ad veritatem ewangelii, dixi Cephe coram omnibus: Si tu, Iudeus cum sis, ceteri apostoli Petrum ex suis provinciis, ac si ab ipso papalis potestas necessario emanaret. Sed Paulus dicit signanter, quod illi, qui videbantur esse aliquid et columpne ecclesie, nichil sibi contulerunt. Ut patet Gal. 2: Deus inquit personam hominis non accipit. Michi enim, qui videbantur esse aliquid, nichil contulerunt, sed econtra cum vidissent, quod creditum est michi ewangelium prepucii sicut et Petro circumcisionis, qui enim operatus est Petro in apostolatu circumcisionis, operatus est michi inter gentes. Et cum cognovissent graciam dei, que data est michi, Iacobus, et Cephas et Iohannes, qui videbantur esse columpne, dextras dederunt michi et Barnabe societatis, ut nos inter gentes, ipsi autem in circumcisione, tantum ut pauperum memores essemus, quod eciam sollicitus fui, hoc ipsum facere.

"Cum autem venisset Cephas Antiochiam, in faciem ei restiti, quia reprehensibilis erat.

"Prius enim, quam venirent quidam ab Jacobo, cum gentibus edebat, cum autem venissent, subtrahebat et segregabat se timens eos, qui ex circumcisione erant et simulacioni eius consenserunt ceteri Iudei, ita ut et Barnabas duceretur in illam simulacionem. Sed cum vidissem, quod non recte ambularent ad veritatem ewangelii, dixi Cephe coram omnibus: Si tu cum Iudeis [sic] sis, gentiliter vivis

gentiliter vivis et non Iudaice, quomodo gentes cogis iudaizare ?''

et non Iudaice, quomodo gentes cogis iudaizare ?''

The passages are here placed side by side without any curtailment, because it will be seen upon a comparison of these with the corresponding passage of Scripture (Gal. ii. 6-14), that Hus even in his citation from the Bible has followed Wiclif. But the agreement of Hus' text with that of Wiclif extends still further; for, as Wiclif, so Hus also draws five several conclusions from the citations already adduced :

Wiclif, *ib.* :

''Istam autem benedictam fidem historicam spiritus sanctus in ewangelio Pauli secundum istam formam inseruit ad confundendum superbiam et heresim sequencium prelatorum.

''Primo igitur patet in hoc ewangelio, quod apud Deum non est accepcio personarum.

''Patet secundo, quod isti tres principales apostoli non contulerunt sensum vel motum ewangelii sancto Paulo . . .

''Patet tertio, quod mundana honorificencia et nomen vocacionis patris sanctissimi non inter istos apostolos relucebat, cum isti precipui confessi sunt Paulum et Barnabam esse sibi socios, non prelatos dominos aut magistros.

''Quarto patet, quomodo Paulus ex caritate Petro patenter restitit, cum certus fuerat, quod peccavit, ad relinquendum exemplum aliis, ut

Hus, *ib.* :

''Istam spiritus sancti historiam homo fidelis considerans

primo conciperet, quod apud Deum non est accepcio personarum . . .

''Secundo, quod Iacobus, Petrus et Iohannes non dederunt potestatem.

''Tertio, quomodo . . . mundana honorificencia et nomen vocacionis patris sanctissimi non relucebat . . .

''. . . confessi sunt Paulum et Barnabam esse sibi socios, non prelatos dominos aut magistros.

''Quarto . . ., quomodo Paulus ex charitate Petro patenter restitit, cum certus fuerat, quod peccavit, ad relinquendum exemplum aliis,

ipsi faciant postmodum sine personarum accepcione similiter.

"Quinto patet, cum quanto fervore et timore notandi ecclesie Paulus servavit contra Petrvm ewangelicam libertatem et utinam ista doctrina foret hodie practicata. Tunc enim cessarent legales ritus istarum sectarum quatuor introducti . . ."

ut ipsi postmodum sine acceptacione personarum faciant similiter.

"Quinto . . . cum quanto fervore Paulus contra Petrum servavit ecclesie ewangelicam libertatem . . ."

As one may observe, the whole sixth chapter of Wiclif's tractate, *De Christo et suo adversario Antichristo*, is simply transferred by Hus to the fourth chapter of his writing against Stanislas of Znaim. Even the marginal observation in Wiclif: "Ciprianus episcopus (qui) 24, q. 1° cap. loquitur ad Petrum, quod omnibus apostolis post resurreccionem suam parem potestatem tribuit," and the closing part of the sixth chapter, *De Christo et adversario*, will be discovered again in separate parts in the ninth chapter of Hus' tractate, *De ecclesia:*

Wiclif, *ibid.*:

"Redeundo ergo ad primum propositum patet logicis, quod Petrus habuit in aliquo prerogativam super ceteros apostolos, et econtra alii Petrum in aliquo excedebant, cum notum sit, cum verbum Christi singulariter dictum Petro fuit exemplar et doctrina sequenti ecclesie militanti. Sed si fuit Petri excellencia simpliciter supra alios, hoc fuit eo (ex) dei gracia et propter meritum humilitatis, que floruit excellencius in Petro.

Hus, *De ecclesia*, fol. 211*ab*:

"Et dictum Augustini est verum, quod Petrus fuit primus inter apostolos secundum aliquam prerogativam . . .

"Petrus enim dicitur aliqualiter fuisse firmus in fide . . ."

Comp. Wiclif, *De Christo*, cap. v.:

"Quis autem apostolorum fuit princeps vel capitaneus plus dilectus, est dissensio apud multos, sed Petrum videtur habere prerogativam humilitatis, paupertatis et voluntarie administracionis, sicut videtur ipsum conversando cum Christo habuisse primatum quendam interrogando, respondendo et operando . . .

"Sed hoc nullo modo innuit, quod Petrus fuit caput ecclesie, sed quod fuit humilior, pauperior et servicior . . ."

"Conceditur autem, quod Petrus a petra ecclesie, que est Christus, habuit humilitatem, paupertatem, fidei firmitatem et consequenter beatitudinem"

Passages from Wiclif's tractate, *De Christo et adversario*, are found also—that we may dispose of *this*, too, under one heading—in the sermons of Hus. Compare:—

Wiclif, *De Christo*, etc., page 54:

"Similiter Christus elegit sibi discipulos simplices, idiotas et mundi pauperes . . . et in introitu ad suam religionem facit eos plus pauperes, ut patet Math. . . .

"Papa autem eligit sibi plures quam duodecim cardinales, plus inclytos, callidos et astutos, et prius mundo abiectos elevat in fulsos dominos urbis et orbis . . .

Sermones 28. mag. J. Hus, *Ad populum*.

1. *Antichristi definicio*.

Opp. Hus, ii., 54*b*:

"Item ubi Christus elegit discipulos simplices, idiotas, mundo pauperes, et in introitum ad suam religionem fecit plus pauperes, ut patet Math. . . .

Ipse pseudo eligit sibi plus inclytos, duplices, callidos et astutos."

Ib., p. 50.	
"Et quantum ad vitam, patet, quod Christus et papa sunt directe contrarii, cum secunda Christi condicio fuit, quod ipse tenuit regularissime summam pauperiem, ut prophetatum est de ipso in veteri lege . . .	". . . Et ubi Christus regularissime tenuit summam paupertatem . . .
". . . Papa autem pretendit se et laborat ad hoc nimis illicite, quod sit seculo summe dives."	". . . iste pseudo irregulariter summe diviciis et seculo innititur . . ."
Ib., p. 51.	
"Quarto sic sub anathemate gravi precipit, . . . quod non adderetur aliquid impertinens vel contrarium legi sue, cum lex sua sit per se sufficiens secundum Augustinum continens singulas veritates . . .	". . . Item ubi Christus sub anathemate gravi prohibuit, quod non adderetur aliquid impertinens legi sue . . . scriptura sacra, in qua secundum Augustinum est omnis veritas . . .
". . . Ideo non mirum, si propter inhiacionem pape et suorum sacerdotum ad secularia desideria sit tota ecclesia militans perturbata . . ."	"Nec mirum, quia sacerdotes et prophete falsi seducunt . . ."
Wiclif, *De Christo et adversario*, p. 57.	*Opp.*, ii., 75*a*. *Sermo* 22, *De Antichristo.*
"Quando autem papa noscit et audit suos pseudoclericos dicere, quod nemo debet ipsum corripere, cum habet in scrinio sui pectoris cunctas leges et potest tam verbo quam opere cum cunctis conditis legibus dispensare, ymo cum lege dei ac articulis fidei, cum potest cuncta talia innovare."	". . . quem nemo debeat corripere, cum sit habens omnes leges in scrinio sui pectoris, ut existens Christi vicarius in terra habet . . . potestatem distribuendi hunc thesaurum hominibus . . ."

In the tractate *De Christo et suo adversario* is emphasised with special earnestness the proposition, which is to be met with indeed also in Wiclif's

Trialogus: "The papacy is of imperial origin; it finds no support in Holy Scripture."

Wiclif, *De Christo*, cap. vii.

"Et constat primo ex fide, quomodo potestas, quam papa exercet fuit a potestate cesarea derivata nec habet fundamentum in fide scripture.

"Ideo si non sit potestas nisi a Deo, patet, quod maior potestas, quam false vendicat, sit potestas sophistica . . ."

Hus, *De ecclesia*, cap. xv.

"Nam cæsar Constantinus . . . papam instituit. Romanus enim pontifex fuit consocius aliis pontificibus usque ad donacionem Cæsaris, cuius autoritate cepit capitaliter dominari . . . Ecce quod pape prefeccio et institucio a Cesaris potencia emanavit . . ."

Trial., IV., xviii., p. 309*f*:

"Narrant chronice, quod in dotacione ecclesie vox angelica audita est in aëre tunc temporis sic dicentis: Hodie effusum est venenum in ecclesia sancta Dei. Unde a tempore Constantini, qui sic dotavit ecclesiam, decrevit Romanum imperium et in ipso dominium seculare . . ."

Hus, *Sermons*, *l.c.*, ii., 29.

"Christ expressly forbade to His Apostles all worldly rule. But His Word was made a mockery and a fable from the time that the Emperor Constantine, three hundred years after the birth of Christ, bestowed a dominion upon the Bishop of Rome; and on that day was heard the voice from above: 'This day the poison was shed forth into the Church' . . ."

Wiclif, *De Christo*, cap. vii.

"Nam licet cesar ex sua stulticia vellet privilegium tale concedere, viri tamen apostolici foret ipsum renuere . . . Christus autem tradidit officium et legem suis discipulis, in quibus . . . . forent plenarie occupati. Quis ergo potuit eis dare potestatem extraneam tardantem vel subtrahentem ab illo officio et ad seculare officium?"

Hus, *De ecclesia*, cap. xv.

"Nunquam indiguit Petrus possessione civili Romana . . . Utinam Petrus dixisset, ego tuam concessionem non accepto . . . quia ea non indigeo et video, quod meis posteris multum nocet. Impedit enim eos in predicacione ewangelii in complecione mandatorum Dei et consiliorum . . ."

Wiclif, *De Christo et adversario Antichristo*, p. 57:

"Et sic ubi Christus docet:

Hus, *Ad scriptum octo doctorum. Opp.* i., 293, 94.

". . . Nam sicut emerunt

Gratis accepistis, gratis date, nichil datur a papa, eciam introitus ad suam locucionem nisi ematur palam vel abscondite, tacite vel expresse. Et sic de infinitis heresibus sue potestatis et operacionis, quibus videtur multipliciter consentire."

Wiclif cites this passage, Matt. x. 8, "Gratis accepistis," etc., with special preference. Compare the *Appendix of Tracts and Documents*, vii., "Fragment of a Sermon, preached by a Carmelite friar, A.D. 1386," in Shirley, *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, 506 *sqq*.

sic vendiderunt. Gratis non acceperunt, gratis non dederunt.

"Et si quis obicit eis in faciem: Christus dixit apostolis et eorum vicariis: Gratis accepistis, gratis date, statim aiunt, murmurant vel expresse dicunt: Ecce hereticus, quid loquitur?"

Comp. Hus, i. 320.

Hus likewise availed himself of other tractates of Wiclif for the composition of his book. In closing the present chapter, it may be well to call attention to another parallel passage of considerable extent[1]:—

Wiclif, *De religionibus vanis monachorum*. Latin controversial writings, ed. Buddensieg (p. 438).

"Numquid Paulus pro vobis crucifixus est . . . Quasi dicat, non. Igitur neque Petrus neque Paulus, neque aliquis alius circa Christum est dignus, ut sit patronus principalis alicuius religionis, quoniam idem apostolus humiliter confitetur subsequenter dicens: Ego plantavi scilicet per predicationem, Apollo rigavit scilicet per . . . baptizacionem, sed Deus incrementum

Hus, *De ecclesia*, cap. ix., fol. 209 *b*:

"Numquid Paulus pro vobis crucifixus est . . . Quasi dicat, non. Igitur neque Petrus neque Paulus, neque aliquis alius circa Christum est principale fundamentum, vel caput ecclesie. Ideo subsequenter 1° Corinthiorum 3° dicit sanctus apostolus . . . Ego inquit plantavi, scilicet per predicacionem, Apollo rigavit, scilicet per baptizacionem, sed Deus incrementum dedit scilicet

[1] I became acquainted with this passage only after the publication of the German edition of my book, and am indebted to Buddensieg for calling my attention to it.

dedit scilicet per graciam fidem et religionis fundacionem. Itaque neque qui plantat est aliquid, neque qui rigat est aliquid, scilicet supra quod potest secta ordo aut religio fundari, sed qui incrementum dat, Deus ipse est ecclesie fundamentum."

per fidei spei et caritatis fundacionem. Itaque neque qui plantat . . . neque qui rigat . . . est aliquid, scilicet supra quod posset fundari ecclesia, sed qui incrementum dat, Deus ipse est ecclesie fundamentum."

Let any one compare the two passages with Paul ad Corinth. I., capp. i., iii., and he will clearly see what the words are which Hus has borrowed from Wiclif. The same is likewise the case as regards that which follows :—

" . . . Hoc autem fundamentum est petra iusticie, de qua loquitur Christus in ewangelio dicens beato Petro :

Tu es Petrus . . .

Super quo dicit beatus Augustinus : Non enim a Petro petra, sed Petrus a petra, sicut nec Christus a christiano, sed christianus a Christo vocatur.

Petra autem erat Christus : non ergo edificabo me supra te, sed te supra me. Nam homines volentes edificare super homines dixerunt : Ego quidem sum Pauli, ego autem Apollo ego vero Cephe . . . per hoc patet, quod nec vivi nec mortui homines . . ."

" . . . Hoc autem fundamentum est petra iusticie, de qua loquitur Christus in ewangelio dicens beato Petro . . .

Tu es Petrus . . .

Super quo beatus Augustinus . . . dicit . . . Non enim a Petro petra, sed Petrus a petra, sicut Christus a christiano, sed christianus a Christo vocatur.

" Petra autem erat Christus . . .

" . . . Nam volentes homines edificari [sic] super homines dicebant : Ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego vero Cephe . . ."

It will be observed that the only change made by Hus is in the order of succession in which single propositions are arranged.

CHAPTER V.

THE TRACTATE OF HUS "DE ABLACIONE TEMPORALIUM A CLERICIS," AND ITS SOURCE.

I employ the singular, and speak of its *source*. For if Hus has derived some few propositions, in this tractate also, from *De Christo et Adversario*, yet here, too, the bulk of his arguments are to be traced back to Wiclif's tractate, *De Ecclesia*, as is proved from the following passages. It may be remarked that only the most conspicuous instances of agreement have been selected.

Wiclif, *De eccl.*, cap. xvi., fol. 65 *a*:

"Secundo suppono, quod clericus tam in Anglia quam alibi posset quantumcunque enormiter peccare quocunque genere peccatorum, patet de episcopo Scarioth, de religioso Sergio et multis aliis sacerdotibus, de quibus scriptura sacra et cronice faciunt mencionem, ymmo cotidiana experiencia idem docet.[1]

Hus, *De ablac. bonorum temporalium a clero. Opp.*, fol. 121 *a*:

"Item supponendo, quod clerus quantumcunque enormiter posset peccare quocunque genere peccatorum, videlicet de episcopo Iuda Scarioth, de religioso Sergio, de Leone papa heretico et multis aliis sacerdotibus, de quibus scriptura sacra et cronice faciunt mencionem, immo quotidiana experiencia iam docet."

[1] In margine: "Et Ioannem papam xxiii., qui pro heretico et diabolo incarnato est condempnatus in Constancia."

Ib., fol. 58 *a b*, cap. xiii. :

"Ex dicto beati Gregorii posito in decretis 18. q. 7. sic dicentis : Pervenit ad nos fama sinistra, quod quidam episcoporum non sacerdotibus proprie diocesis decimas atque Christianorum oblaciones conferant, sed pocius laicalibus personis, militum videlicet sive serviciorum vel quod gravius est eciam consanguineis. Unde si quis amodo episcopus inventus fuerit huius divini precepti transgressor, inter maximos hereticos et pessimos antichristos non minimus habeatur.

"Et sicut Nicena synodus de simoniacis censuit : et qui dat episcopus et qui recipiunt ab eo laici sive pacto sive beneficio, eterni incendii ignibus deputentur . .

Ib., cap. xvi., fol. 65 *b* :

"Ex istis sic arguo : Reges Anglie sepe abstulerunt temporalia simpliciter a clero suo, ut patet ex supposicione tercia et nec unquam abstulerunt sic legitime nec potuerunt legitime sic auferre, ut patet ex secunda conclusione et tercia doctoris. Ergo in hoc fecerunt, qualiter non potuerunt legitime facere. Ex quo sequitur, ultra quod in hoc fecerunt, qualiter non potuerunt meritorie vel de lege dei facere et cum omne opus humanum ex deliberacione sua procedens sit legitimum vel illegitimum, meritorium vel demeritorium (sequitur, quod illegitime)[1] sic fecerunt.

Ib., fol. 121 *b* :

"Unde declarando, quando episcopus abutitur bonis ecclesie, scribit b. Gregorius : Pervenit ad nos fama sinistra, quod quidam episcoporum non sacerdotibus proprie diocesis decimas atque Christianorum oblaciones conferant, sed pocius laicalibus personis, militum videlicet sive serviciorum vel quod gravius est eciam consanguineis. Unde si quis episcopus inventus fuerit huius divini precepti transgressor, inter maximos hereticos et antichristos non minus habeatur.

"Et sicut Nicena synodus de simoniacis censuit : et qui dat episcopus et qui recipiunt laici sive pacto sive beneficio, eterni incendii ignibus deputentur."

Fol. 122 *a* :

"Item multi reges sepe abstulerunt temporalia simpliciter a clero delinquente, ut patet ex destruccione Templariorum . . . et nec unquam abstulerunt sic legitime nec potuerunt legitime sic auferre, ut patet per adversarios.

"Ergo in hoc fecerunt, qualiter non potuerunt legitime facere. Ex quo sequitur ultra, quod in hoc fecerunt, qualiter non potuerunt meritorie vel de lege dei facere. Et cum omne opus humanum ex deliberacione sua procedens sit legitimum vel illegitimum, meritorium vel demeritorium, sequitur, quod illegitime sic fecerunt. Et ultra sequitur,

[1] Wanting in the MS.

Et ultra sequitur, quod inciderunt ut sic in errorem periculosum, quia tam corporis quam anime dampnabiliter perditivum.

"Et supposito errore isto in facto patet, quod est pertinaciter defensatus, quia rex et regnum constanter defendunt hanc potestatem tamquam legitimam eciam usque ad mortem cum gladio, si oportet. Et quod error iste sit directe contrarius catholice veritati, patet tripliciter ex dictis: primo quia rex sic faciendo fecit, quod non licuit nec licere potuit, ut sequitur ex datis, secundo quia iniuste abstulit aliena contra mandata secunde tabule, et tercio quia fecit ista non in caritate contra veritatem catholicam apostoli 1. Cor. 16. Omnia vestra in caritate fiant. Et totum antecedens est ab adversario concedendum.

"Ex quibus ultra colligitur, quod reges Anglie in sic faciendo sunt heretici, et cum illud usque ad mortem defenderant, sequitur, quod decesserunt heretici et dampnati et revera religiosus possessionatus, qui credit hec omnia, vel remisse vel nullo modo oraret pro dictis regibus iam defunctis . . ."

Ib., fol. 65*b*, 66*a*:

"Secundo arguitur, quod nedum potuit sed decuit eum sic dotasse ecclesiam, ut licite posset subtrahere elemo-

quod inciderunt ut sic in errorem periculosum, quia tam corporis quam anime dampnabiliter perditivum.

"Et supposito errore illo in facto patet . . .[1]

"Et quod error ille sit directe contrarius catholice veritati, patet tripliciter: primo quia reges sic faciendo fecerunt, quod non licuit nec licere potuit.

"Secundo quia iniuste abstulerunt aliena contra mandatum secunde tabule, et tercio quia fecerunt ista non in caritate contra veritatem catholicam Ap. 1. Cor. 15. Omnia vestra in caritate fiant. Et totum antecedens est ab adversario concedendum.

"Et supposito errore . . . si reges pertinaciter illum defenderunt . . . fuerunt heretici. Quod si illud usque ad mortem defenderunt, sequitur, quod decesserunt heretici et dampnati. Ex quo ulterius sequitur, quod clerici possessionati, qui credunt iam dicta, non orarent pro dictis regibus iam defunctis . . ."

Ib., 122*b*:

"Item imperator vel rex nedum potuit sed decuit eum sic dotasse ecclesiam, ut licite posset subtrahere elemo-

[1] The continuation follows lower down in another connection.

sinas suas in casu, quo earum abusus vergat in detrimentum regni et subtraccionem evangelii . . Ex istis sic arguitur, si secundum istam formam dotassent nostram ecclesiam, licite potuissent pro contemptu regio suam elemosinam subtraxisse. Sed cum ista condicione potuerunt dotasse nostram ecclesiam, ergo potuerunt pro contemptu cleri datam elemosynam licite subtraxisse. Cum ergo illa condicio fuisset licita et honesta consuetudoque regis et regni, docent in facto condicionem illam fuisse adiectam. Videtur nimis presumptuosa assercio, quod principes nostri non potuerunt ab eis auferre temporalia quantumcunque deliquerint, ymmo cum absolute necessario potuerunt talem condicionem adicere et iterum absolute necessario elemosinarii possent tantum delinquere. Patet, ut sepe dixi, quod principes nostri absolute necessario potuerunt suas elemosynas subtrahere periculo possibili imminente et per idem sequitur, quod potuerunt cum possibilibus paribus subtrahere in futurum, quod sonat directe contra terciam conclusionem doctoris . . .

Ib., fol. 66*a*:

". . . Nam rex Anglie dotans ecclesiam suam nec debuit nec potuit ipsam dotare ad enervacionem vel deterioracionem regni sui, cum omnis potestas sit a Deo, qui non potest dare potenciam ad hunc

sinas suas in casu, quo earum abusus vergat in detrimentum regni et subtraccionem predicacionis ewangelii . . Ex istis sic arguitur: Si imperator vel rex secundum istam formam dotasset Pragensem ecclesiam, licite potuisset pro detrimento regni, pro contemptu regio . . . suam elemosinam subtraxisse Sed cum ista condicione ipse imperator vel rex potuit dotasse Pragensem ecclesiam. Ergo potuit pro contemptu cleri datam elemosynam licite subtraxisse. Cum ergo illa condicio fuisset licita et honesta consuetudoque regis et regni, docent in facto condicionem illam fuisse adiectam. Videtur nimis presumptuosa assercio, quod ipsi principes nostri non possent ab eis auferre temporalia, quantumcunque deliquerint. Immo cum simpliciter necessario potuerunt talem condicionem adicere et iterum simpliciter necessario elemosinarii possent tantum delinquere. Patet, quod ipsi principes nostri simpliciter necessario potuerunt suas elemosynas subtrahere periculo possibili imminente et per idem sequitur, quod potuerunt cum possibilibus paribus subtrahere in futurum."

Ib., fol. 122*b*:

". . . Item rex Boemie vel imperator dotans ecclesiam suam nec debuit nec potuit ipsam dotare ad enervacionem vel deterioracionem regni sui, cum omnis potestas sit a Deo, qui non potest dare po-

finem. Sed sic contingeret supposito, quod rex absolute dotasset suam ecclesiam non subintelligendo condicionem illam, ergo oportuit condicionem illam subintelligi et per consequens, quando contemptus cleri accidit, rex capiendo temporalia in manus suas non facit clero illi iniuriam, cum condicio ex defectu cleri dissolvitur. Minor autem argumenti sic ostenditur: Si omnia illa bona, quibus dotatur nostra ecclesia, immediate et directe pertinerent ad papam, sic quod rex non habeat interesse in possessionibus vel personis, cum plusquam quarta pars regni sit devoluta ad manum mortuam, sequitur, quod rex noster non sit rex tocius Anglie, cum plus quam quarta pars in manu mortua est decisa . . .''

tenciam ad hunc finem. Sed sic contingeret supposito, quod rex vel imperator absolute dotasset suam ecclesiam non subintelligendo condicionem supradictam, ergo oportuit condicionem illam subintelligi et per consequens, quando contemptus cleri accidit, rex accipiendo temporalia in manus suas non facit clero illi iniuriam, cum condicio ex defectu cleri dissolvitur. Minor autem argumenti sic ostenditur: Si omnia illa bona, quibus dotatur nostra ecclesia, immediate et directe pertinerent ad papam, sic quod rex non habeat interesse in possessionibus vel personis, cum plus quam quarta pars regni sit devoluta ad manum mortuam, sequitur, quod rex noster non sit rex tocius Boemie, cum plus quam quarta pars in manu mortua est decisa.''

Ib., fol. 66*a*:

''. . . Relinquitur eis dicere, quod rex noster sit quoad omnia mortificata in regno nostro vel exclusus simpliciter vel pape subdominans. Sibi enim non licet ut inquiunt interponere de clero vel possessionibus suis, quantumcunque deliquerint, nec regi licet subtrahere temporalia eorum, quantumcunque abusus vergat periculum, quia ut inquiunt excepti sunt a iurisdiccione regis tam in corpore quam in bonis et immediate subiecti pape . . .''

Ib, fol. 123*a*:

''. . . Quo posito regis nostri dominium extinguetur . . .

''. . . regi enim non licet ut inquiunt clerici interponere de clero vel possessionibus suis, quantumcunque deliquerint, nec regi licet subtrahere temporalia eorum, quantumcunque abusus vergat ad regni periculum, quia ut inquiunt excepti sunt a iurisdiccione regis tam in corpore, quam in bonis et immediate subiecti pape . . .''

Ib., fol. 66*b*:

"Confirmatur tripliciter: primo per hoc, quod iuxta decretum beati Gregorii positum 11. q. 3. privilegium omnino debet amittere, qui sibi permissa abutitur potestate, sed omnis clericus abutens elemosinis regis sibi permissa abutitur potestate. Cum ergo illa dotacio sit privilegium, sequitur, quod illud omnino debet amittere. Sed per quem nisi per regem privilegiantem? Illius enim est privilegium interpretari et defendere, cuius est condere.

"Confirmatur ex illo Math. 13. Omni habenti dabitur et habundabit, ab eo autem, qui non habet et quod videtur habere, auferetur ab eo. Cum ergo rex tenetur sic habundare ex titulo iusticie, videtur, quod ab eo debet causari ablacio sui elemosinarii supposito, quod contingat eum videri habere elemosinas, quas non habet . . .

Fol. 67*a*:

"Tercio confirmatur ex lege debiti elemosine spiritualis. Nam rex tenetur tam ex iure Dei quam regni servare quantum sufficit legiis suis iusticiam et debitum opus spiritualis misericordie, ut patet superius tractatu de privilegiis, sed precipuum opus talis misericordie regi pertinens foret castigacio coactiva ad continuandum suas elemosinas, ergo idem debet impendere. Unde qui offenduntur maxime ad verbum de ablacione temporalium, vendicant,

Ib. 123:

". . . Item iuxta decretum Gregorii 11. q. 3. privilegium omnino debet amittere, qui sibi permissa abutitur potestate. Sed omnis clericus abutens elemosinis regis sibi permissa abutitur potestate.

"Cum ergo illa dotacio sit privilegium, sequitur, quod illud omnino debet amittere. Sed per quem nisi per regem privilegiantem? Illius enim est privilegium interpretari et defendere, cuius est condere . . .

"Confirmatur ex illo Math. 13. Omni habenti dabitur et abundabit, ab eo autem, qui non habet, et (quod) videtur habere, auferetur ab eo. Cum rex tenetur sic abundare ex titulo iusticie, videtur, quod ab eo debet causari ablacio sui elemosinarii supposito, quod contingat eum videri habere elemosinas, quas non habet . . .

". . . Confirmatur ex lege debiti elemosine spiritualis. Nam rex tenetur tam ex iure Dei quam regni servare quantum sufficit legiis suis iusticiam et debitum opus spiritualis misericordie, sed precipuum opus talis misericordie regi pertinens foret castigacio coactiva ad continuandum suas elemosynas. Ergo illud debet impendere.

"Unde clerici, qui offenduntur maxime ad verbum de ablacione temporalium, ven-

quod seculares defendant elemosinas suorum progenitorum in suo robore permanentes, quod non fit iuxta dicta 22 cap., nisi dum ecclesia habet profectum ex modo elemosynandi, sic quod collata remaneant in racione privilegii vel elemosine, quod extinguitur, dum elemosinarii collatis elemosynis abutuntur, quamvis enim permaneat pie donantis,[1] tamen donum corporale perdit racionem elemosine . . .

"Si ergo domini temporales, ut elemosynati vendicant, tenentur continuare elemosynas patrum, quorum sunt heredes, tunc tenentur ad omne inde sequens formari, quia aliter contra possibilitatem obligacionis divine forent ad contradictoria obligati, scilicet ad faciendum ipsas elemosynas ad defendendum earum abusum in discolis, secundum quam racionem carent forma elemosyne. Ergo cum reges Anglie tenentur servare elemosynas suorum progenitorum in sua perpetuitate, tenentur insuper ex lege spiritualis elemosyne suos legios castigare. Tenentur tercio ex obligacione, qua tenentur facere legiis suis iusticiam et extinguere iniurias, que vergunt periculosissime ad sui populi detrimentum.

"Patet, quod tenentur in casu bona sua ecclesie sancte restituere et a contemptoribus Dei sui et regni auferre. Hoc enim fuit pactum (fol. 67 *b*) dicant, quod seculares defendant elemosynas suorum progenitorum in suo robore permanentes, quod non fit, nisi dum ecclesia habet profectum ex modo elemosynandi, sic quod collata remaneant in racione privilegii vel elemosyne, quod extinguitur dum elemosynarii elemosynis abutuntur . . .

"Si ergo domini temporales, ut elemosynati clerici vendicant, tenentur continuare elemosynas patrum, quorum sunt heredes, tunc tenentur ad omne inde sequens formari, quia aliter contra possibilitatem obligacionis divine forent ad contradictoria obligati, scilicet ad faciendum ipsas elemosynas et ad defendendum ipsarum abusum in discolis secundum quam racionem carent forma elemosyne. Ergo cum reges et seculares domini tenentur servare elemosynas suorum progenitorum in sua perpetuitate, tenentur insuper ex lege spiritualis elemosyne suos legios castigare. Tenentur eciam ex obligacione, qua tenentur subditis suis facere iusticiam et extinguere iniurias, que vergunt periculosissime ad sui populi detrimentum.

"Patet, quod tenentur in casu bona sua sancte ecclesie restituere et a contemptoribus Dei sui et regni auferre. Hoc enim fuit pactum dotacionis

[1] Sc. "racio."

dotacionis primeve. Ideo audenter assero, si cum istis paribus rex noster non habet potestatem ad faciendum in clero suo opus misericorditer castigandi, non habet sufficienciam super tota regno nostro politice dominandi, ymmo si non bene attendimus ad scripturam sacram et dicta privilegiis ecclesie, cognoscemus, quod[1] sonat in privilegium regis, quod habeat potenciam taliter clericos cohercendi et clerici habent privilegium, eo quod habent talem prepositum, cui sic meritorie possent subdi."

Ib., 67 *b*:

"Et iterum adieccio temporalium communiter non est ita propinqua ultime necessitati salvacionis penitencia corporee, sicut subtraccio abusi est propinqua ultime necessitati salvacionis perpetue tam corporis quam anime. Sicut enim est opus maioris misericordie auferre gladium a frenetico volente se ipsum occidere, quam dare gladium persecuto ad defendendum se a volente eum occidere quia peius foret hominem occidi sic a se ipso quam occidi ab alio, quia primum est dampnabile et secundum semper meritorium sive iustum. Et ad hoc sunt multe leges ecclesie, ut allegavi superius 11 cap. huius ex dictis Augustini positis 23. q. 4. . . . Non omnis qui parcit primeve. Unde si cum istis paribus rex noster non habet potestatum ad faciendum in clero suo opus misericordie castigandi, non habet sufficienciam super toto regno nostro politice dominandi, immo si bene attendimus ad scripturam sacram et dicta de privilegiis ecclesie, cognoscemus, quod sonat in privilegium regis, quod habeat potenciam taliter clericos coercendi et clerici habent privilegium, eo quod habent talem prepositum, cui sic meritorie possunt subdi."

Ib., fol. 123 *b*:

"Item adieccio temporalium communiter non est ita propinqua ultime necessitati salvacionis penitencie corporee, sicut subtraccio abusi est propinqua ultime necessitati salvacionis perpetue tam corporis quam anime. Sicut est opus maioris misericordie auferre gladium phrenetico volente se ipsum occidere, quam dare gladium persecuto ad defendendum se a volente eum occidere, quia peius foret hominem occidi sic a se ipso quam occidi ab alio, quia primum est dampnabile, secundum meritorium sive iustum. Et ad propositum est beatus Augustinus 5. q. 5. Non omnis qui parcit amicus est nec omnis qui verberat inimicus.

[1] In *Cod.*: "ecclesie et sonat."

amicus est nec omnis qui verberat inimicus.

"Meliora enim sunt vulnera amici quam fraudulenta oscula inimici. Melius est cum severitate diligere quam cum lenitate decipere. Et sequitur ad propositum: Utilius esurienti panis tollitur, si de cibo securus negligat iusticiam, quam esurienti panis frangitur, ut iusticie seductus adquiescat. Et qui freneticum ligat et qui letargicum excitat, ambobus molestus ambos amat. Quis nos potest amare amplius quam Deus et tamen . . .

"Unde inter omnia peccata, de quibus magis timeo, in superioribus regni nostri sunt ceca pietas, falsa misericordia et consentanea ommissio sive ex negligencia sive quod maxime horrendum est, quando venditur consensus criminis et iniuste ac proditorie per patrimonium Christi defenditur eius hostis. Unde Augustinus epistola tercia ad Macedonium: misericordius opem nostram talibus subtrahimus quam impendimus. Non enim opem fert, qui ad peccandum iuvat ac non pocius subvertit et opprimit . . ."

"Meliora enim sunt vulnera amici quam fraudulenta oscula inimici. Melius est cum severitate diligere quam cum lenitate decipere. Et sequitur ad propositum: Utilius esurienti panis tollitur, si de cibo securus negligat iusticiam, quam esurienti panis frangitur ut iniusticie seductus adquiescat. Et qui phreneticum ligat et qui letargicum excitat ambobus molestus ambos amat . . .

"Unde inter omnia peccata, de quibus magis timendum est, in superioribus regni nostri Boemie sunt ceca pietas, falsa misericordia et consentanea ommissio sive ex negligencia sive quod maxime horrendum est, quando venditur consensus criminis et iniuste per cleri elemosynam defenditur hostis Christi. Unde Augustinus ad Macedonium epistola tercia: misericordius opem talibus subtrahimus quam impendimus. Non enim opem fert, qui ad peccandum iuvat sed pocius subvertit et opprimit . . ."

In connection with Hus' tractate *De ablacione bonorum* we may mention incidentally a few additional passages which he has excerpted from other of Wiclif's larger or smaller works, and applied to his purpose.

Wiclif, *De Simonia. Cod. un. Prag.* X. E. 9, fol. 73 ff.

"Et plane patet, ut sepe dixi, quod domini temporales possunt licite auferre temporalia ab ecclesia delinquente. Nec valet dicere, quod oportet in istis omnino expectare decretum Romani pontificis, quia sepe ille cum cardinalibus suis sit simoniacus et a brachio seculari depositus virtute primi pape. Ideo absit, quod fallacia antichristi seducat mundi principes et claudat tela aranee manus suas, ne ex defectu iuvaminis sui et matri ecclesie vadant ad inferni precipites . . ."

Comp. Lewis, *The History of John Wiclif*, p. 384.

"Si Deus est, domini temporales possunt legitime ac meritorie auferre bona fortune ab ecclesia delinquente." . . .

Cf. *Fasciculi zizaniorum*, ed. by Shirley, 248.

"Et quod talis ablacio foret in casu plus meritoria quam prior collacio, eo quod illa foret in casu spirituale opus misericordie salvans animam a gehenna et impetrans utriusque beatitudinem. Et ut videtur, sicut dotacio potest esse occasio beatitudinis sic veresimilius ablacio."

Cf. *Trial.* IV., xviii., p. 308.

"Et sepe predicando ac reprobando Christus verbaliter corripuit sacerdotes . . . ac

Hus, *De ablacione bonorum temporalium a clericis*, fol. 123:

"Item reges, principes et omnes domini temporales tenentur ad fraternam correpcionem . . . potest esse, quod clericus delinquat cum tali circumstancia, quod correpcio fraterna efficacissima foret, temporalia quibus abutitur prudenter diripere. Nec valet dicere quod pape dispensacio, privilegiacio vel exempcio hoc excludit."

"Cuius exemplo si domini temporales obligantur ad dandum elemosynas clericis, ut debite ministrent in suo officio, eciam obligantur ex lege charitatis, quod clericis abutentibus datis elemosynis ipsas auferant ab eis, ne per abusum earum animas proprias occidant."

Cf. Hus, *l.c.*, 118*b*.

"Item Titus et Vespasianus . . . habuerunt potestatem a Deo concessam 42 annis post

post ascensionem anno 42 in servis suis Tito et Vespasiano sacerdotes suos dire corripuit."

accensionem ad auferendum temporalia."

The whole tractate of Hus, *De ablacione bonorum temporalium a clericis*, consequently defends one of the so-called forty-five articles of Wiclif in his very words.

CHAPTER VI.

THE TRACTATE OF HUS AGAINST THE PAPAL INDULGENCE, AND ITS SOURCES.

HERE Hus has, with regard to the main subject, drawn from three writings of Wiclif: 1, the chapter *De indulgencia* from the great treatise on the Church; 2, from the tractate *De absolucione a pena et a culpa*; and in the third place the *Dialogus*. Of the greatest importance is the first of these, for from this is derived, *e.g.*, the very definition of the indulgence.

Cod. pal. Vind., 3929, fol. 107. Cap. "Indulgencia":

"In primis ergo suppono significacionem, quid nominis huius signi indulgencia:

"Est enim omnis indulgencia actus indulgentis, ita quod indulgencia non sit aliud nisi habentem ad hoc potenciam indulgere, et est indulgere gratis concedere, operam dare sive remittere, et componitur deinde et algere, quid est frigere vel mortificari, sicut est de commissis oblivioni traditis quoad expeticionem vindicte. Et sic loquitur scriptura Iudith 8°. Indulgenciam domini cum

Opera, i., fol. 175*a*:

"Quantum ad primum suppono significacionem huius signi indulgencia:

"Est enim indulgencia actus indulgentis, ita quod indulgencia non sit aliud nisi habentem ad hoc potenciam indulgere, et est indulgere gratis concedere, operam dare sive remittere vindictam." . . .

". . . Et sic loquitur scriptura Iudith 8°. Indulgenciam

lacrimis postulemus. Et sic sumitur Is. 26, 61, et 63. Sic autem indulgere peccatoribus est Deo proprium sicut et peccata dimittere, ut patet Cap. ultimo." . . .

Sed ab istis sensibus extractus est terminus et baptizatus in alium partim per doctores theologie et partim per canonistas. Quandoque enim secundum eos notat remissionem pene, ut sec. quest. 3. cap. Indulgencia, ut notat archidiaconus, quod quandoque active concessionem (connotat), ut dominus papa indulsit subdito hoc vel illud id est concessit. Aliquando autem signat dispensacionem, aliquando ius, ut notat Ioannes 33. q. 2. Interfectores, et aliquando recipitur pro remittere vel condonare, ut de pena et remissionibus cap. Indulgencia in principio per archidiaconum.

3929, fol. 113*b*:

"Dico octavo, quod sacerdotes Christi, licet habeant potestatem ad absolvendum subditos a pena et a culpa, non tamen debent absolvere sub hac forma, nec subiecti istud expetere, nisi hoc specialiter fuerit revelatum.

"Prima pars patet ex hoc, quod sacerdos potest sacramentaliter ostendere sibi confitentem taliter absolutum, qui ad tantum conteritur, quod statim decedens sine pena purgatorii advolaret, et hoc est sacerdotum absolvere. domini cum lacrimis postulemus. Et sic sumitur Es. 26, 61, et 63. Sic autem indulgere peccatoribus est Deo proprium sic et peccata dimittere, prout omnes sancti doctores dicunt concorditer ex scriptura."

"Sed ab istis sensibus extractus est terminus et baptizatus in alium partim per theologos partim per canonistas. Quandoque enim secundum eos indulgencia connotat remissionem pene, ut 2. quest. 3. cap. Indulgencia, ut notat archidiaconus, quod quandoque concessionem active connotat, ut dominus papa indulsit subdito hoc vel illud id est concessit. Aliquando autem signat dispensacionem, aliquando ius, ut notat Ioannes 33. q. 2. Interfectores, et aliquando accipitur pro remittere vel condonare, ut de pena et re. cap. Indulgencia in principio per archidiaconum."

Opera, 175*a*:

"Dico secundo, quod sacerdotes Christi, licet habeant potestatem absolvendi subditos a pena et a culpa, non tamen debent absolvere sub hac forma, nec absolvendi debent illud expetere, nisi hoc specialiter fuerit revelatum.

"Prima pars patet ex hoc, quod sacerdos potest sacramentaliter ostendere sibi confitentem taliter absolutum, qui ad tantum conteritur, quod statim decedens sine pena purgatorii ad patriam perveniret, et hoc est sacerdo-

Nec est potestas alicuius sacerdotis in casu ultime necessitatis sic ligata, quin quantum Deus revelans permiserit, possit absolvere. Foret autem nimia presumpcio aliquem Christi vicarium absolucionem talem pretendere, nisi Deus hoc sibi revelaverit faciendum, ne forte incurrat blasphemum mendacium. Quid ergo valeret subiectos inportune absolucionem talem expetere, cum certe debent credere, quod correspondenter ad sua merita vel demerita taxabuntur?

"Licet autem sufficiat apud Christum ubique presentem contricio, tamen sacramentum penitencie est valde necessarium, licet non proderit sine illa. Ideo foret stulticia sacerdotem, cui non fit ad hoc revelacio, diffinire, quod penitencia vel aliud sacramentum suo suscipienti proderit ad salutem."

tum absolvere. Nec est potestas alicuius sacerdotis in casu ultime necessitatis sic ligata, quin quantum Deus revelans permiserit, possit absolvere. Foret autem nimia presumptio aliquem Christi vicarium absolucionem talem pretendere, nisi Deus hoc sibi revelaverit faciendum, ne forte incurrat blasphemum mendacium. Quid ergo valeret subiectos importune absolucionem talem expetere, cum certe debent credere, quod correspondenter ad sua merita vel demerita taxabuntur?

"Licet autem sufficiat apud Christum ubique presentem contricio, tamen sacramentum penitencie est valde necessarium, licet non proderit sine contricione presupposita. Ideo foret stulticia sacerdotem, cui non sit ad hoc revelacio, definire, quod penitencia vel aliud sacramentum suo suscipienti proderit ad salutem."

fol. 113*b*:

"Dico primo, quod nemo est capax indulgencie, nisi fuerit et de quanto fuerit dignus vel dispositus per graciam apud deum. Patet ex hoc, quod nemo si non Deus dat tales indulgencias, qui non dat nisi caris suis, quos sic prius habilitat.

"Dico scundo, quod omnis recipiens tales indulgencias de tanto copiosius eas recipit, de quanto fuerit habilior quoad Deum. Patet ex hoc, quod precise de tanto Deus dat sibi copiosius tales

fol. 175*b*:

"Dico tercio, quod nemo est capax indulgencie, nisi fuerit et de quanto fuerit dignus vel dispositus per graciam apud deum. Patet ex hoc, quod nemo si non Deus dat tales indulgencias, qui non dat nisi caris suis, quos sic habilitat.

"Dico quarto, quod omnis recipiens tales indulgencias de tanto (copiosius) eas recipit, de quanto fuerit habilior quoad Deum. Patet ex hoc, quod precise de tanto Deus dat sibi copiosius tales

indulgencias, sed ipse facit quidquid facit ad regulam."

indulgencias, sed ipse facit quidquid facit ad regulam."

With regard to the proposition further occurring with Hus at this place, compare *Trialogus*, pp. 356, 357.

"Dico tercio, quod nullius episcopi prodest indulgencia homini, nisi de quanto prius (se) disposuit apud deum. Patet ex hoc, quod Deus non dat sibi talem indulgenciam, nisi ad tantum ex proposicione proxima, sed precise de tanto cuiusquam episcopi indulgencia prodest.

"Dico quarto, quod episcopi indulgencia de tanto recipienti proderit, de quanto episcopus eum in fide Christi instruxerit et in devocionem et amorem dei accenderit vel quomodocunque habilem ad indulgenciam Dei fecerit. Patet totum ex dictis.

Dico quinto, quod sacerdotes Christi non habent potestatem donandi indulgencias secundum quantitatem temporis, nisi eis specialiter fuerit revelatum. Patet ex illo Morali Iudith 8°. Posuistis vos tempus miseracionis domini et in arbitrio vestro diem constituistis ei. Ille ergo, cui non sit ad hoc revelacio, qui spondet indigno apud deum ex sibi dubio, quod infra tantum tempus Deus miserebitur eius, donando sibi plenam remissionem, stulta pangit, cum non habet evidenciam, quod Deus illud concessit.

"Dico sexto, quod ex fide

"Dico quinto, quod nullius pape vel episcopi prodest indulgencia homini, nisi de quanto prius se disposuerit apud deum. Patet ex hoc, quod Deus non dat sibi talem indulgenciam, nisi ad quantum se disposuerit, ut patet ex predictis.

"Dico sexto, quod episcopi indulgencia de tanto recipienti proderit, de quanto episcopus eum in fide instruxerit et in devocionem et amorem dei accenderit vel quomodocunque habilem ad indulgenciam Dei fecerit. Patet totum ex iam dictis.

"Dico septimo, quod sacerdotes Christi non habent potestatem donandi indulgencias secundum quantitatem temporis, nisi eis specialiter fuerit revelatum. Patet ex illo Iudith 8°. Posuistis vos tempus miseracionis domini et in arbitrio vestro diem constituistis ei. Ille ergo, cui non fit ad hoc revelacio, qui spondet indigno apud deum ex sibi dubio, quod infra tantum tempus Deus miserebitur eius, donando sibi plenam remissionem, stulta pangit, cum non habet evidenciam ex lege Christi vel revelacione, quod Deus illud concessit.

scripture, in qua est omnis veritas, non fundabitur, quod licet vicario Christi, cui non sit ad hoc specialis revelacio, ut donet diurnas indulgencias vel annales. Patet ex hoc, quod ex scriptura, que non obviat sibi ipsi, foret talis indulgencia temptacio Dei et seduccio populi.

"Dico septimo, quod prelati ecclesie debent in ista veritate catholica subiectos instruere, ne laici infideliter occupati circa minus utilia attendant. Patet in simili ex lege questorum, quibus limitatum est, quod non dicant populo, nisi quod in literis episcoporum eis fuerit limitatum, ut patet in libro septimo de penitenciis et remissionibus cap. Abusionibus."

"Multo magis ergo Christi vicarii debent docere populum secundum limites literarum spiritus sancti, quas eis tradidit ad docendum."

Cod. pal. Vind. 3929, fol. 110*b*:

"Item Deus propter nullam magnificacionem papalis penitencie preiudicat sue iusticie, sed hoc contingeret data ista potencia, ergo illa non est fingenda. Minor sic probatur: Papa sicut tota ecclesia militans errat in multis, que concernunt divinum iudicium et statum ecclesie triumphantis, sed inter alia arcana huius hoc est unum, quis quanto sit dignus divino suffragio quoad Deum, ergo stat papam errare communiter in talibus. Ideo ergo [sic] opor-

"Dico octavo, quod prelati ecclesie debent in ista veritate catholica subiectos instruere, ne laici infideliter occupati circa minus utilia attendant. Patet in simili ex lege questorum, quibus limitatum est, quod non dicant populo, nisi quod literis episcoporum eis fuerit limitatum, ut patet in libro de penitenciis capitulo Abusionibus."

"Multo magis ergo Christi vicarii debent docere populum secundum limites literarum spiritus sancti, quas ei tradidit ad docendum."

Fol. 183*b*:

"Item Deus propter nullam magnificacionem papalis penitencie preiudicat sue iusticie, sed hoc contingeret data ista potencia, ergo illa non est fingenda. Minor sic probatur: Papa sicut tota ecclesia militans errat in multis, que concernunt divinum iudicium et statum ecclesie triumphantis, sed inter alia arcana huius hoc est unum, quis quanto sit dignus divino suffragio quoad Deum, ergo stat papam errare communiter in talibus. Ideo oportet con-

tet concedere, quod eo ipso, quo papa concedit alicui tantam indulgenciam, eo ipso sic habebit vel aliter non obstante concessione pape, precise tantum participabit, quantum dignus fuerit apud Deum. Vel aliter, quod papa generaliter intelligat istam condicionem in concessione sua qualibet, ut oportet.

"Prima pars est omnino impossibilis implicans papam illum non posse peccare vel errare et sic papa per se habilitaret et iustificaret subditum, quoad deum, quod foret blasphemum dicere.

"Ideo restat secunda via et tercia. Sed constat non oportere sumptuose acquirere tales bullas, quia illis subductis homo precise tantum participabit de merito, quanto fuerit habilis apud deum."

Fol. 111 *a*:

"Item videtur, quod papa debet ex consciencia facere generaliter illud opus misericordie spiritualis, nam potens relevare fratrem suum et inexcusabiliter differens usque ad mortem corporalem fratris sui, est reus homicidii: Ergo multo magis differens liberare fratrem a morte spirituali cuiusmodi est quicunque papa avarus de indulgencia generali. Nec valet dicere, quod potestas prelati in isto vilesceret, quia generaliter prestatarius ex beneficii percepcione fit carior. Quam ergo excusacionem haberet, qui a dampnacione perpetua posset

cedere, quod eo ipso, quo papa concedit alicui tantam indulgenciam, eo ipso sic habebit vel aliter non obstante concessione pape, precise tantum participabit, quantum dignus fuerit apud Deum. Vel aliter, quod papa generaliter intelligat istam condicionem in concessione sua qualibet, ut oportet.

"Prima pars est omnino impossibilis implicans papam illum non posse peccare vel errare et sic papa per se habilitaret et iustificaret subditum, quoad deum, quod foret blasphemum dicere.

"Ideo restat secunda via et tercia concedenda. Sed constat non oportere sumptuose acquirere tales bullas, quia illis subductis homo precise tantum participabit de merito, quantum fuerit habilis apud deum."

Opera, fol. 184 *a*:

"Item videtur, quod papa debet ex consciencia facere generaliter illud opus misericordie spiritualis, nam potens relevare fratrem suum et inexcusabiliter differens usque ad mortem corporalem fratris sui, est reus homicidii: Ergo multo magis differens liberare fratrem a morte spirituali cuiusmodi est quicunque papa . . . de indulgenci generali. Nec valet dicere, quod potestas eius vilesceret in isto, quia generaliter prestatarius ex beneficii percepcione fit carior. Quam ergo excusacionem haberet, qui a dampnacione perpetua posset proxi-

proximum liberare, quem debet diligere ut se ipsum, et tamen sine racione ommittit. Numquid ille, cui preceptum est eciam in sabbato extrahere bovem fratris de puteo, non incurreret prevaricacionem, si negligit liberare animam proximi de inferno? Si ignorancia voluntatis divine excusat, quomodo alicui concedere talem indulgenciam papa temptat?"

Questio de absolucione a pena et a culpa, Ib. fol. 263:

"Circa hanc epistolam dubitatur, utrum sapit blasphemiam papam sic bullative concedere absolucionem a pena et a culpa . . . et videtur michi, quod non, quia sine excepcione persone prescite dicit se absolvere quemlibet talem sibi in illo, quod appetit complacentum, et sepe sunt multi tales, quos Deo non placet sic absolvere. Ergo sepe in talibus absolucionibus contrariatur beneplacito Dei sui. Sepe quidem non placet deo monere illam personam ad contricionem, cui tamen papa concedit talem indulgenciam. Similiter papa multis talibus concedit indulgencias, qui ex sibi dubio sunt presciti, et Deus nulli tali concedit tales indulgencias, ergo pape extolluntur in talibus supra Christum.

"Similiter requiritur ad talem concessionem discretam papam habere noticiam, quod Deus ad tantum approbat tale factum, sed papa caret tali noticia tam ex revelacione,

mum liberare, quem debet diligere ut se ipsum, et tamen sine racione dimittit. Numquid ille, cui preceptum eciam in sabbato extrahere bovem fratris de puteo, non intraret prevaricacionem, si negligit liberare animam proximi de inferno? Si ignorancia voluntatis divine excusat, quomodo alicui concedere talem indulgenciam papa temptat?"

Hus, *Adversus indulgencias papales*, fol. 182*b*:

"Contra dacionem pape, qua dat absolucionem a pena et a culpa, arguitur primo sic:

"Papa sine excepcione persone prescite dicit se absolvere quemlibet talem sibi in illo, quod appetit complacentem, et sepe sunt multi tales, quos Deus non placet sic absolvere. Ergo sepe in talibus absolucionibus contrariatur beneplacito Dei sui. Sepe quidem non placet deo monere illam personam ad contricionem, cui tamen papa concedit talem indulgenciam. Item papa multis talibus concedit indulgencias, qui ex sibi dubio sunt presciti, et Deus nulli tali concedit tales indulgencias, ergo papa in talibus extollitur supra Christum.

"Item requiritur ad talem concessionem discretam papam habere noticiam, quod Deus approbat tale factum, sed sepe papa caret tali noticia tam ex revelacione, quam

quam ex fide scripture, quam tercio ex racionis deduccione. Quid ergo moveret papam tam presumptive concedere, quod Deus ex sibi dubio non concedit, vel vendere, quod non placet Deo reddere? Revera evidencius posset papa movere homines ad purgandum latrinas vel faciendum quodcunque opus corporale, quod sibi placuerit, quam absolvere quemcunque a pena et culpa, qui iuvat ad restituendum sibi cesaream dignitatem, quia hoc directe contrariatur ordinacioni divine in Christo et suis apostolis et cuicunque vero successori eorum. Similiter nichil est magis proprium Deo quam donare vel remittere iniuriam sibi factam, sed sic facit papa in concessione cuiuscunque talis indulgencie, ergo concedit in talibus, quod Deo est proprium. Nam nullus secularis dominus vel homo alius potest concedere alteri, quod remittat vicarie iniuriam sibi factum nisi dominus ille vel homo prius sic fecerit, ergo multo magis Deus non potest concedere pape vicariam potestatem sic condonare Dei iniuriam nisi Deus antea sic condonet. Et confirmatur ex hoc, quod illam condonacionem oportet esse Dei volicionem . . . Qua ergo fronte presumeret antichristus, quod condonat Dei iniuriam, nisi Deus hoc expresse sibi precepit, et tunc diceret, quod Deus sic condonat vel remittit. Cum enim papa in talibus indulgenciis errare poterit, non debet capi ex fide scripture, quam tercio ex racionis deduccione. Quid ergo moveret papam tam presumptive concedere, quod Deus ex sibi dubio non concedit, vel vendere, quod non placet vendere? Revera posset evidencius papa movere homines ad agendum reales penitencias seu realem penitenciam vel ad colendum agros vel faciendum quodcunque opus corporale, quod placuit, quam absolvere quemcunque a pena et a culpa, qui iuvat ad restituendum sibi secularis domini potestatem.

"Item nichil est magis proprium Deo quam donare vel remittere iniuriam sibi factam. Sed sic facit papa in concessione talis indulgencie, ergo concedit in talibus, quod est Deo proprium. Nam nullus secularis dominus vel homo alius potest concedere alteri, quod remittat vicarie iniuriam sibi factum, nisi dominus ille vel homo prius sic fecerit, ergo multo magis Deus non potest concedere pape vicariam, etc. . . .

"Adversus indulgencias papales

fol. 183*a*:

"Qua ergo fronte presumeret papa, quod condonat Dei iniuriam, nisi hoc Deus expresse sibi precepit et tunc diceret, quod Deus sic condonat vel remittit. Cum enim papa in talibus indulgenciis errare poterit, nec debet capi ut fides nec ut sperandum neque ut

ut fides nec ut sperandum neque ut probabile. Quod si papa pretendit se dare tales indulgencias propter causam quam limitat, tunc necesse est, quod Deus hoc approbat, quia tunc papa posset ad votum Dei flectere voluntatem plus, quam aliqua creatura posset variare voluntatem alterius, secundum quod papa suam variaverit voluntatem. Sed quid incredibilius aut blasphemius hominem super se assumere? Posset ergo papa dicere de illo, quem scit esse meritorium de Dei beneplacito, quod si istud compleveris, Deus tibi retribuet, secundum quod sibi placuerit. Sed ad quantam mensuram, Deus reservat sibi noticiam."

probabile. Quod si papa pretendit se dare tales indulgencias propter causam quam limitat, tunc necesse est, quod Deus hoc approbet, quia tunc papa posset ad votum Dei flectere voluntatem plus, quam aliqua creatura posset variare voluntatem alterius.

"Sed quid incredibilius hominem illud super se assumere? Posset ergo papa dicere de illo, quem scit esse meritorium, de Dei beneplacito, quod si istud compleveris, Deus tibi retribuet, secundum quod sibi placuerit. Sed ad quam mensuram, Deus reservat sibi noticiam."

The tractate of Wiclif, *De absolucione a pena*, has thus, so far as concerns the first half of it, passed over entire into Hus' tractate, *Adversus indulgencias papales*. The words which Hus has omitted are but few, and equally few those he has added. As regards the changes made by him, only one particular calls for notice. Where a severe or rude form of expression is met with in Wiclif, Hus has introduced a slight alteration. Thus he has altered the passage in Wiclif's proposition: "Revera posset papa movere homines ad purgandum latrinas," into the less obnoxious "ad colendum agros."

With respect to the indulgences one may compare also:—

Wiclif, *De Christo et adversario*, cap. x:
"Similiter ut fides capitur,

Hus, *Adversus indulgencias papales*. *Opera*, fol. 184*a*:

quod papa sit pater sanctissimus et caput ecclesie in tantum, quod ut experimento didici, negans istam sententiam erit tamquam hereticus persecutus. Sed certum est quod nec papa in persona propria nec ecclesia conversans cum illo, cui non sit revelacio, scit, si predestinatus fuerit vel prescitus et per consequens, si sit membrum ecclesie vel diabolus incarnatus."

"Papa non potest assecurare aliquem, quod post mortem vel ante tantam indulgenciam habebit . . . papa enim subducta revelacione nescit de aliquo, si sit predestinatus a domino. Quod si prescitus fuerit, non proderunt sibi tales indulgencie ad beatitudinem contra ordinacionem domini eternaliter ordinantis."

Cf. Hus, *De ecclesia*, cap. xiii. *Opera*, i. 221 and ii. 77*b*.

Wiclif, *Trial.* IV., xxxii., p. 359.

Pursues the same line of thought in a slightly different form: "Quomodo ergo non extollitur super dominum Iesum Christum? In cuius signum non legitur, quod Christus tales absoluciones vel indulgencias concesserat nec aliquis de suis apostolis."

. . .

Hus, *Adversus indulgencias papales.* *Opera*, i. 183:

"Item papa multis talibus concedit indulgencias, qui ex sibi dubio sunt presciti et Deus nulli tali concedit tales indulgencias, ergo papa in talibus extollitur super Christum."

Hus, *Opera*, i. 187:

"Unde quesivi et usque hodie requiro, quis sanctorum donavit indulgencias et non invenio."

The *Dialogus* is again very strongly drawn upon by Hus:—

Cod. pal. Vindob. 3922, fol. 75*b*:

"Multitudini non semper est credendum.

". . . Qui autem credit ut

Hus, *Adversus indulgencias papales. Opera*, i. 187*b*:

"Multitudini non semper standum.

". . . Unde qui credit, ut

fidem communitati vel populo, est in ianuis, ut stolide seducatur. Quia Eccl. primo scribitur: Stultorum infinitus est numerus. Et sapiens Daniel, cum populus dampnasset Susannam ex falso testimonio sacerdotum, signatur multitudo testimonii approbare, cuius patet contrarium. Daniel ultimo. Et Helias foret per quadringentos sacerdotes Baal in causa domini superatus. Cuius contrarium patet 3 Reg. 18.

"Ideo prudentes habent hanc consuetudinem, quando difficultas circa veritatem aliquam ventilatur, inprimis considerant, quid fides scripture loquitur in hoc puncto et quidquid hic fides in illa materia definiverit, credunt stabiliter tamquam fidem. Si autem fides scripture neutram partem eius expresserit, dimittunt illud tamquam eis impertinens et non litigant, que pars habeat veritatem. Et ista est magna prudencia sapientum.

"Ideo non est stulta evidencia, si maior pars militancium sic asserit, ergo verum? cum sit argumentum topicum ad contrarium concludendum, quia Deus scit, si nunc militant plures filii patris mendacii quam filii veritatis."

fidat [sic] communitati vel populo, est in ianuis, ut stolide seducatur. Quia Ecclesiast. primo scribitur: Stultorum infinitus est numerus. Et sapiens Daniel, cum populus damnasset Susannam ex falso sacerdotum testimonio, ipse unicus contradixit. Daniel xiii. Et Helias foret per quadringentos sacerdotes Baal, si semper staretur multitunini, in causa domini superatus. Cuius contrarium patet 3 Reg. 18.

"Ideo prudentes habent hanc consuetudinem, quando difficultas circa veritatem aliquam ventilatur, inprimis considerant, quid fides scripture loquatur in hoc puncto et quidquid fides in illa materia definiverit, credunt stabiliter tanquam fidem. Si autem fides scripture neutram partem eius expresserit, dimittunt illud tamquam eis impertinens et non litigant, que pars habeat veritatem. Et ista est magna prudencia sapientum. Ideo satis est parva evidencia, si maior pars militancium sic asserit, ergo verum, cum sit argumentum topicum ad concludendum contrarium. Nam Deus scit, si nunc militant plures filii patris mendacii quam filii veritatis."

CHAPTER VII.

THE TRACTATE "DE SEX ERRORIBUS," AND ITS SOURCES.

THIS tractate contains, as is well known, six chapters, and treats therein of the work of creating and of the Creator, of faith, of the forgiveness of sins, of obedience, of excommunication, and of simony. The contents of these chapters were inscribed upon the walls of the Bethlehem chapel.[1] In this way the faithful who frequented it had Wiclif's thoughts and reasonings always before their eyes. That the chapters of this dissertation contain nothing else, is evident upon a comparison of the texts. It may suffice, for brevity's sake, to bring forward for comparison two chapters, the second and sixth.

The subject-matter of the chapter concerning faith has been treated by Hus himself in several places in an analogous manner. We find it not only on the walls of the Bethlehem chapel, but also more largely expanded under the title "Questio de credere,"[2] and

[1] "Opusculum magistri Johannis Hus de sex erroribus compilatum atque cura ipsius Prage parietibus Bethlehemiticis inscriptum anno domini 1413." *Hussi Opera*, i. 191 *b*.

[2] *Opera*, i. 169 *b*.

finally in the little work he composed on the ten commandments within his prison at Constance.[1] Yea, Hus even caused an official notification to be made of his discussions *De credere*.[2] As Hus, so Wiclif also has in many places argued out the subject of this chapter; and thus, in this respect too, Hus appears as the veritable disciple of Wiclif. The latter handles this matter in his tractate *De ecclesia* (*Cod. palat. Vindob.* 3929, fol. 187 sqq., or 4527, fol. 115 sqq.), and in his *Questio ad fratres de sacramento altaris*. We make comparison of the latter:—

From the *Questio ad fratres de sacramento altaris.* *Cod. un. Prag.* 3 G. 11. 8 *b*:

"Personarum accepcio est preponderancia unius persone in amore supra alium contraria legi Dei. Sed heu personarum accepcio et bonorum omnium postposicio perturbat inquisicionem, excecat eleccionem et retardat iusticie execucionem . . .

"Aliud est credere rem, aliud credere rei, aliud credere in rem. Credere rem est fidem habere de re, quam non videt credens. Et sic credimus Deum (et de) Deo quem non videmus, angelos et demones esse et credimus omnes articulos fidei, sed non credimus in ipsos, unde quoad istud proposuit salvator Marthe Joh. 11° istum articulum . . .

"Ecce salvator ei duos arti-

Entirely identical with Hus, *Tractatus de tribus dubiis. Opp.*, pag. 69 *b*. Comp. also *Opp.* 29 *b*.

"Hus' tractate begins only with the paragraph "Quia dubitantibus," and extends to "Abscondita tenebrarum. Amen."

Comp. also *Opp. Hussi*, i., p. 48 *b*.

(Sermo de fidei sue elucidacione):

"Aliud est credere rem, aliud credere in rem, aliud credere rei. Credere rem est fidem habere de re, quam non videt credens. Et sic credimus Deum et de Deo quem non videmus. Similiter credimus, quidquid scriptura dicit nobis credendum, ut credimus angelos et demones esse . . .

[1] *Opera*, 29 *b*.

[2] Pez, *Thes. Anecd.*, iv. 2, 426-430. *Vide supra*, pp. 138, 148, 157.

culos credibiles quisitive proposuit . . .

"Credere vero rei est habere pro vero, quod res ista dicit esse verum. Et sic credimus toti scripture sacre sed non in scripturam . . . Et hinc salvator sepe hortatus, est ut sibi crederent, unde dixit Joh. 4. ad Samaritanam: Crede michi mulier . . .

"Credere vero rei est habere pro vero, quod res illa dicit esse verum. Et sic credimus toti scripture sacre sed non in scripturam . . .

Credere autem in rem est ipsam supreme diligere, et cum nichil supreme debet diligi a creatura racionabili quam Deus, patet quod in nullam rem est credendum aliam quam in Deum. Et de illo credere est illud verbum Christi Dei: Amen, Amen dico vobis. Qui credit in me, habit vitam eternam.

"Credere autem in rem est ipsam supreme diligere, et cum nihil debet supreme diligi a creatura racionali quam Deus, patet, quod in nullam rem est credendum aliam quam in Deum. Et de illo credere est illud verbum Christi: Amen dico vobis . . .

"Ad istam triplicem distinccionem de credere loquitur venerabilis Beda super illud apostoli: Credenti autem . . . Aliud est credere in Deum, aliud Deo, aliud credere Deum. Credere Deo est credere vera esse, que loquitur . . . credere Deum est credere quod ipse sit Deus, credere in Deum est credendo amare . . ."

"Ad istam triplicem distinccionem de credere loquitur venerabilis Beda super illud apostoli: Crendenti autem . . .

The sixth chapter of this tractate, entitled *De simonia*, is entirely founded on Wiclif's tractate bearing the same name. In the first place the very definition of Simony is derived therefrom. Let any compare—

Wiclif, *De simonia*, *Cod. un. Prag.*, X. E., ix, fol. 71:

"Sequitur descripcio simonie: Describunt autem periti simoniam, quod est in-

Hus, *De sex erroribus*, *Opera* i. 194 *a*:

"Simonia est studiosa voluntas emendi aliquid spirituale. Sed brevius et

ordinata volicio spiritualia pro temporalibus commutandi. Hoc enim est clarius quam hoc genus: Studiosa voluntas, quia nedum licet omni homini, sed debet emere beatudinem et per consequens debet studiose emere spirituale."

melius: Simonia est inordinata volicio spirituale pro temporalibus commutandi."

Thus not only has Hus adopted the two definitions from Wiclif, but also his taste. As Wiclif looks upon the first as clearer, so Hus likewise speaks of it as shorter and better. The fund of quotations, moreover, is derived from Wiclif:—

Wiclif, *De ecclesia*:

"... Qui sacros ordines vendunt vel emunt, sacerdotes esse non possunt. Unde scriptum est anathema danti vel anathema accipienti: Hec est Symoniaca heresis. Quo modo ergo si anathema sunt et sancti non sunt, sanctificare animos possunt et cum in Christi corpore non sunt, quomodo corpus Christi tradere vel accipere possunt. Qui maledictus est, benedicere quomodo potest?"

Hus, *Ib.*:

"... Qui sacros ordines vendunt vel emunt, sacerdotes esse non possunt. Unde scriptum est anathema danti vel anathema accipienti: Hec est symoniaca heresis. Quo modo ergo si anathema sunt et sancti non sunt, sanctificare animos possunt et cum in Christi corpore non sunt, quomodo corpus Christi tradere vel accipere possunt. Qui maledictus est, benedicere quomodo potest?

In like manner the whole lengthy period, belonging to Gregory's seventeenth homily, was taken by Hus from Wiclif. It is to be found in the said tractate, *Cod. Un. Prag.*, X. E. ix., on fol. 72. Thus, also, he proceeds with that which follows:—

Wiclif, *l.c.* 108, 109:

"Pervenit ad nos sinistra fama, quod quidam episcoporum non sacerdotibus proprie diocesis decimas atque

Hus, *Ib.*, 194 *a*:

"Pervenit ad nos sinistra fama, quod quidam episcoporum non sacerdotibus proprie diocesis decimas atque

Christianorum oblaciones offerant, sed pocious laicalibus personis militum videlicet sive servitorum vel quod gravius est eciam consanguineis.

"Unde si quis amodo episcopus inventus fuerit huiusmodi divini precepti transgressor, inter maximos hereticos et" . . .

christianorum oblaciones offerant, sed pocius laicalibus personis militum videlicet sive servitorum vel quod gravius est eciam consanguineis. Unde si quis amodo episcopus inventus fuerit huiusmodi divini precepti transgressor, inter maximos hereticos et pessimos" . . .

The remainder as above, pp. 225, 226.

Similar utterances of Wiclif's with regard to simony will be met with in his other books. In this place it is clear that Hus transcribes Wiclif's tractate *De simonia*, but in other cases the question as to which the tractate was from which Hus adopted the one or the other passage, does not assume so simple a form. In exemplification of this statement only a few instances need here be adduced.

As regards, in the first place, Hus' doctrine of the Church, he has notably appropriated the corresponding doctrines of Wiclif in their entirety, and with verbal fidelity. Seeing the great abundance of proof-passages in addition to that already cited at large in the first chapter, which were probably turned to account by Hus, we may content ourselves with some of the more pregnant ones from other works of Wiclif, whereby the relation becomes most distinctly apparent :

Wiclif, *Trialogus*, pag. 325 :

"Sed vere dicitur ecclesia corpus Christi mysticum, quod verbis predestinacionis eternis est cum Christo sponso ecclesie copulatum. Et talis est triplex ecclesia, scilicet mili-

Hus, *De ecclesia*, cap. i. and ii. :

". . . Ipsa eciam universalis ecclesia sancta et corpus Christi mysticum . . .

"Sciendum est, quod ipsa

tans, dormiens, et triumphans.

"Militans est corpus predestinatorum dum hic viat in patriam; ecclesia dormiens est predestinati in purgatorio pacientes et ecclesia triumphans est beati in patria quiescentes."

Cf. Wiclif, *Sermones Cod. univ. Prag.*, III. G. xi., fol. 120:

"Ista autem ecclesia catholica dividitur in tres partes scicilet in ecclesiam militantem, ecclesiam dormientem, et ecclesiam triumphantem."

Cf. Wiclif, *De Christo et adversario antichristo*, cap. i:

"Secundum catholicos ecclesia est predestinatorum universitas . . . Et sic est triplex ecclesia scilicet triumphancium in celo, ecclesia militancium hic in mundo et ecclesia dormiencium in purgatorio . . .

Wiclif, *De Christo*, 1:

. . . Ecclesia clericorum, qui debent esse propinquissimi ecclesie triumphanti et iuvare residuum ecclesie militantis.

sancta ecclesia universalis tripartitur: scilicet in ecclesiam triumphantem, militantem, et dormientem. Ecclesia militans est numerus predestinatorum dum viat hic ad patriam, ecclesia dormiens est numerus predestinatorum in purgatorio paciens . . .

". . . ecclesia triumphans est beati in patria quiescentes."

Cf. Hus, *Opera*, 1, 51 *a*, De fidei sue elucidacione.

Hus, *De ecclesia*, *Opera*, 1, 206 *b*, and *Opera*, 2, 28. "Sermo habitus a. 1405."

Hus, *De ecclesia*, cap. i.:

"Ecclesia sancta catholica est omnium predestinatorum universitas"

Comp. Hus, *Sermons* (German, by Novotny i. 19):

"Christ chose unto Himself a bride, namely, the holy Church, which is the congregation or union of all those who are elected unto everlasting salvation."

Cap. i.:

"Pars illius ecclesia peregrinans sive militans iuvatur ab ecclesia triumphante."

CHAPTER VIII.

THE EMPLOYMENT OF OTHER OF WICLIF'S TRACTATES BY HUS.

1.—Wiclif's Tractate "De universalibus."

I CITE here only the most distinctive passage, which has notably been regarded as furnishing important points of support for the characterisation of Hus.

Cod. un. Prag., viii., F. 1, fol. 7 *b*, 8 *a*:

"... Ego autem statui michi ipsi pro regula, quod quociescunque videro racionem (vel scripturam)[1] prevalidam, declino ab opinione priori non obstante fama vel assercione virorum quos sequerer considerans, quod ex infirmitate nature longe plus habeo ignorancie quam certitudinis."

Hus, *De trinitate*. *Opera*, 1, 105:

"... Nec in hoc actu nec in quocunque alio per me fiendo in posterum intendo aliquid pertinaciter asserere vel defendere, quod esset sacre scripture contrarium vel quovismodo erroneum. Quod si aliquid talium ex ignorancia vel lapsu lingue dicerem, paratus sum revocare humiliter. Et si aliqua persona ecclesie me scriptura sacra vel racione valida docuerit, paratissime consentire. Nam a primo studii mei tempore hoc michi statui pro

[1] Is wanting in *Cod. un. Prag.*, viii. F. 1; supplemented in accordance with Höfler, *Anna v. Luxemburg*, in the Memorials of the Academy of Vienna, 20, 150; where manifestly another codex has been employed, since variations present themselves also elsewhere in the text.

regula, ut quociescunque saniorem sentenciam in quacunque materia percipe-rem, a priori sentencia gaudenter et humiliter de-clinarem sciens, quoniam illa que scimus sunt minima illorum que ignoramus, ut ait Themistius."

The other more lengthy protestations of Hus are likewise to be met with in Wiclif. The second of the above-quoted sentences reads with Wiclif: "Quod si ex ignorancia vel quacunque alia causa" (Hus puts as above the concrete case: "vel lapsu lingue") "in isto defecero . . . revoco et retracto submittens me humiliter."[1]

2.—Wiclif, "De oracione dominica."

Even the little dissertation on the Lord's Prayer was reasoned out by Hus in manifest dependence upon Wiclif; for there exists also a tractate *Super oracione dominica* from the pen of the latter.[2] The agreement between the two dissertations is here much less close than in the case of other works; and this was only natural, when we consider that Hus composed his tractate in the prison,—it is said, at the request of one of his guards,—and that no books were here accessible to him.[3]

Wiclif's dissertation was a much longer one; Hus

[1] See Wiclif's Protestations in Höfler, *Anna von Luxemburg*, p. 147, seq.

[2] Shirley, a Catalogue of the Original Works of John Wyclif, p. 18; *Cod. Palat. Vindob.* 3929, fol. 182-184.

[3] "Nullius libri copia adiuvatus." Hus, *Opera*, i., 30 *a*. There exists for the rest also a larger work of Hus on the second subject (*Opera*, i. 29 *b*). It bears the title: *Incipit exposicio decalogi excerpta Prage per Iohannem Hus.* To

is satisfied with accompanying the single petitions of the Lord's Prayer with a few elucidatory remarks often confined to a single line, where Wiclif employs a whole chapter. The division of the material is with Hus the same as with Wiclif. In both dissertations the seven petitions which are contained in the Lord's Prayer are preceded by a lengthy exposition, setting forth the high significance of this prayer. As Wiclif carries out the thought that this prayer excels all others, and that alike by virtue of its authority,—since it proceeds from the Lord Jesus Christ Himself,—as also because, notwithstanding its brevity, it includes within itself all other prayers,—so also has Hus expressed himself in analogous language. Compare

Wiclif, *De or. dom. Cod. pal. Vind.* 3929, fol. 182:

"Istis autem suppositis et premissa fide de ecclesia sancta catholica et transcurrendum est leviter de oracione dominica supponendo ut fidem, quod inter omnes oraciones illa excedit alias in auctoritate, in brevitate et in necessaria subtilitate. Excedit inquam cunctas oraciones alias in auctoritate, quia Christus Deus et homo ipsam dictavit et docuit in persona propria, quod de multis aliis oracionibus non estimo me legisse, nam multas alias oraciones fecit Deus per sanctos ut catholica membra sua, sed

Hus, *De oracione dominica. Opp.* i. 31 *a*:

". . . sciendum, quod dominica oracio est pre aliis oracionibus eligenda et dicenda. Primo ex eo, quod piissimus pater suis filiis et optimus magister suis discipulis ipsam composuit. Secundo quia omne, quod est homini necessarium petere, in ipsa implicatur. Et tercio quia est brevis. Brevem enim magnus dominus oracionem composuit, ut ipsam cito servus addisceret."

what extent this contains Wiclif's propositions I have not had the opportunity of investigating; there are to be found in it citations from the Statutes of Arnest of Pardubitz. *Codex of the Stud. Bibl. in Olmutz*, i. v. 34.

istam oracionem fecit et docuit in persona propria . . . Ad secundum, quod est brevitas: continet enim septem peticiones . . .''

3. Wiclif, "De ordinibus ecclesie."

Cod. un. Prag. X. E. ix. fol. 150*b*, 151*ab*:

"Videtur autem sanctis doctoribus, quod superfluit in sacramento ordinis ponere plures quam duos gradus scilicet diaconos vel levitas et presbyteros sive episcopos. Nam illi duo gradus suffecerant in lege veteri, ubi multiplicius fuit ministerium Dei . . .

". . . Ad quid ergo oportet ponere alios tres gradus inferiores in clero scilicet clericum prime censure, acolitum et subdiaconum? Nam nec racio ministerii nec auctoritas facit evidenciam, quod in statu cleri isti tres gradus clerici sunt distincti. Igitur videtur irracionabile et infundamenta(bi)le, quod ecclesia militans sit cum istis tribus ordinibus onerata. Et quibusdam videtur, quod 70 discipuli, de quibus Luc. 10, erant diaconi et duodecim principales discipuli erant sacerdotes atque episcopi . . .

"Non claret fidelibus, quod in lege aliqua[1] fuerunt de clero alii ordines, quam diaconi atque sacerdotes, presbyteri sive episcopi. Nec sequitur ex diversitate officii diversitas ordinum in clero, quia tunc

Hus, *De ecclesia*, cap. 15. *Opera* i. 226*a*:

"Cum igitur ex ordinacione Christi tempore apostolorum duo ordines cleri pro sua ecclesia suffecerint scilicet diaconus et sacerdos . . ''

Vide supra. Hus did not adopt, word for word, the reasoning here placed in parallel. There can be no doubt, however, but likewise in his historic contemplations with respect to the original grades

[1] Antiqua.

foret ex abusu cesareo in officiis secularibus implicatus, multipliciter in ordine variatus . .

". . . unde quidam vocant omnes episcopos, archiepiscopos et papas noviter introductos prelatos cesareos et non ponunt novum ordinem nisi secularis dominus ipsummet constituat . . ."

of the clergy, Wiclif served as his authority.

4.—"The Trialogue."

Trial., ed. Lechler, 423:

"Ex istis racionibus potest colligi vel Avinionacus, quem aliqui vocant papam aut summum et immediatum Chrisi vicarium in terris, sit fons et origo tocius nequicie in militante ecclesia, ac si foret precipuus antichristus . . ."

Wiclif, *De Christo*, cap. viii.:

"Unde quidam fideles publicant in vulgari, quod sicut bonum esset habere papam, qui sequeretur Christum et Petrum in moribus et doctrina, sic malum esset habere papam, qui in his duobus foret pastoribus istis contrarius. Si papa adversatur istis pastoribus in vita moribus et doctrina, tunc est precipuus antichristus."

Cf. *Trialogi supplem.* 454:

"Episcopus Romanus, qui dicit se inter omnes mortales immediatum Christi vicarium non obstante, quod

Hus, to Christian of Prachatitz. *Docum. mag. Hus*, 60. *Geschichtschr.*, ii. 228.

"In istis volo stare, quod habeo papam pro vicario Christi in ecclesia Romana, sed non est mihi fides.

"Item in isto sto: si papa est predestinatus et exercet officium pastorale sequens Christum in moribus, tunc est caput tante militantis ecclesie, quantam regit. Et si sic regit capitaliter secundum legem Christi totam iam militantem ecclesiam, tunc est verus eius capitaneus sub archicapite domino Jesu Christo. Si vero vivit Christo contrarie, tunc est fur, latro ascendens aliunde, et est lupus rapax hyprocrita et nunc inter omnes viantes precipuus antichristus."

sit vite Christi tantum contrarius, potest vocari demonium."

Comp. further Wiclif, *De Christo*, cap. x. :

"Nam hodie capitur tamquam fides, quod non est possibile, papam manentem papam errare in moribus et specialiter in fide catholica, quia capitur tamquam regula . . . cum certum sit, quod papa sit vir temptabilis . . . patet, quod faciliter potest corruere in quamcunque voraginem viciorum. Nam apostoli ut Petrus et ceteri in presencia magistri optimi in multa vicia corruerunt . . ."

Ib., page 61 :

"Hostiensis in lectura super 5° decretalium cap. A. nobis tenet, quod papa sicut et tota curia Romana errare poterit in via morum, sicut sepe errat in iudicio veritatis. Istam exposicionem audacter teneo. Quia ex quo duodecim apostoli erraverunt in iudicio veritatis et in via morum a Christo electi et habentes spiritum sanctum, quomodo papa cum cardinalibus non poterint in iudicio veritatis deficere et in via morum ?"

Hus, it is true, had also at hand in this instance, as he himself likewise says, the decretals of Innocent III., *A nobis* (de dato Lat. 2 Non. Maii 1199).[1]

Hus availed himself of the *Trialogue* in many other passages too, which we do not propose at this place to examine more in detail. We shall here adduce only a few of the more noticeable of them. That Hus was wont, besides, to set forth Wiclif's tenets to his flock from the pulpit, is well known. In the case of some of them it may be doubtful, in one respect only, *i.e.*, whether he derived them from the *Trialogue* or some other of Wiclif's works. No doubt can arise with regard to the former of the two passages cited below ; this unquestionably owes its origin to the *Trialogue*. There is found, on the

[1] See *Corpus iur. can.*, ed. Friedberg, ii. 899.

other hand, in the second an observation on Pope Clement, which is made by Wiclif not only in his tractate *De Christo et suo adversario Antichristo*, but also in the *Trialogue*. We believe, however, that we shall not err in assuming that Hus would take the passage in question from that tractate in which he sought most trenchantly to assail the papacy. But this was the case in the dissertation *De Christo et suo adversario*.

In his twenty-eighth sermon Hus speaks of the vice of avarice. Like Wiclif, he takes his start from the passage in the First Epistle of Paul to Timothy, where it is said of avarice:[1] "Que est radix omnium malorum." This agreement might appear an external and purely accidental one, were it not that in the explanation of the notion of avarice Hus has altogether appropriated the definition made thereof by Wiclif:

Trialogus, 190:

"Sed quantum ad avariciam potest dici, quod ispa descriptive ad nostram intencionem est inordinatus amor temporalium. Et intelligo temporalia, ut sunt vulgariter intellecta scilicet pro omni terrena substancia, que potest esse de possessione hominis. Intelligo eciam per temporalia habitudines respectivas in rebus terrenis fundatas, quas homo irracionabiliter appetit, sicut do-

Hus, *Monum. altera pars*, p. 80*a*:

"Quantum ad primum: avaricia

"est inordinatus amor temporalium. Et intelligo temporalia

"pro omni terrena substancia, que potest esse de possessione hominis

"et habitudines respectivas in rebus terrenis fundatas, quas homo irracionabiliter appetit, sicut

[1] More properly of *cupiditas*, as is also correctly read in the *Trialogus* (ed. Lechler), and that in accordance with Tim. vi. 10.

mini a et honores mundanos, que ex possessione talium oriuntur."

Comp. also Wiclif, *De Christo et adversario*, cap. xiv.:

"Papa autem vellet extendere suam iurisdiccionem per totam terram habitabilem, dum lucrum sibi saperent, quia per hoc creditur, quod mandavit angelis rapere spiritum care entis hoc spirituale suffragium in numerum beatorum. Ymmo si crederet illud sonarè sibi in lucrum, vellet suam iurisdiccionem extendere per vacuum infinitum . . ."

dominia et honores[1] mundanos, que ex possessione[2] talium oriuntur."

Hus, *De ecclesia*, cap. xii.:

"Nimis ergo papa Clemens suam potestatem laxaverat mandans in sua bulla angelis, quod animam peregrinantis Romam . . . introducant . . ."

Cf. cap. xxiii. *Opera* 264:

"Mandamus angelis paradisi, quod animam . . ."

Comp. Wiclif, *Trialogus*, 4, cap. xxxii.

"Dicitur enim, quod papa pretendit se habere potenciam ad salvandum singulos viatores, et quantumcunque viantes deliquerint, nedum ad mitigandum penas ad suffragandum eis cum absolucionibus et indulgenciis, ne unquam veniant ad purgatorium, sed ad precipiendum sanctis angelis, ut anima separata a corpore indilate ipsam deferant in requiem sempiternam . . ."

Comp. Hus' Sermons, translated by Novotny, iii. 52:

"But they set their mouth against heaven, inasmuch as they preach that they have power to open to everyone the kingdom of heaven . . . And is not that insolently to raise his head high above the angels of God, and to howl as the wolves, when Pope Clement in his bull commands the holy angels at once to bear to heaven the soul of the man who should die upon a pilgrimage to Rome . . . ?"

5.—Wiclif, "De triplici vinculo amoris."

Of great interest is a passage in Wiclif's tractate *De triplici vinculo amoris*. For it has been thought[3]

[1] With Hus there stands "homines mundanos," which is manifestly an error of the transcriber.

[2] With Hus "passione."

[3] Comp. Palacky, *Gesch. v. Böhmen*, iii. 1, 24, and Höfler, *Anna von Luxemburg*, 46.

the inference is to be drawn from it, that the daughter of the Emperor Charles IV., Anne of Luxemburg, who was married to King Richard II. of England, was in possession of a Bible with Latin, German, and Czechian text. From this alleged fact further conclusions are then made, into which there is no reason for entering more particularly at this place. To what extent, however, this assumption itself is warranted may be discovered from the text, which has been adopted word for word, as presented by Wiclif, by Hus in his tractate against the Englishman John Stokes. The passage reads :—

De triplici vinculo amoris. Cod. un. Prag. X. E. 9, fol. 139 :

". . . Et ex eodem patet eorum stulticia, qui volunt dampnare scripta tamquam heretica propter hoc, quod scribuntur in Anglico, et acute tangunt peccata, que conturbant illam provinciam. Nam possibile est, quod nobilis regina Anglie soror cesaris evangelium habeat in lingua triplici exaratum, scilicet in lingua bohemica, in lingua theotunica et latina. Et hereticare ipsam propterea implicite, foret luciferina superbia. Et sicut Theotonici volunt in isto racionabiliter defendere linguam suam . . ."

Hus, *Contra Anglicum Johannem Stokes. Opera* 108 *b* :

". . . Ex eodem patet eorum stulticia, qui volunt dampnare scripta tamquam heretica propter hec, quod scribunt(ur) in Anglico, et acuta tangunt peccata, que conturbant illam provinciam. Nam possibile est, quod nobilis regina Anglie soror cesaris evangelium habeat in lingua triplici exaratum, scilicet in lingua boemica, teutonica et latina. Et hereticare eam propterea, foret luciferina stulticia. Et sicut Teutonic' volunt in isto racionabiliter defendere linguam propriam sic et Anglici debent de racione defendere linguam suam . . ."

That we are not by any means compelled to attach the sense above indicated to the passage of this tractate, is clear. That which Wiclif represents

as a possibility ("nam possibile est quod habeat"), is apprehended as a fact. Moreover this passage, as was already urged by another,[1] stands with Wiclif out of connection with the preceding text;[2] so that it must be looked upon as a note, which by some hasty transcriber has been inserted at the wrong place. But this must have been done at an early period, because Hus himself expressly observes that he took this passage from the tractate of Wiclif *De triplici vinculo amoris*.[3] In the case of Hus it is remarkable that he should take over this passage with such complete verbal fidelity,—he writes in the year 1411,—without a single word of allusion to the death of the erewhile queen, which took place in the year 1394. In Hus' tractate she meets us as an entire stranger, and yet it is to be assumed that he did not thoughtlessly transfer this passage from Wiclif to his own pages.

6.—Wiclif, "De fide catholica."[4]

Cod. un. Prag. 3, G. 11, fol. 243:

"Quamvis ista fides de

[1] Höfler, *l.c.*, 46.

[2] It is preceded by a lengthy period, of which I cite only a part: "Ex istis colligitur, quam periculosum et stultum est, imponere hominibus et specialiter mundi principibus, quod non sint heredes legitimi propter causas tales humanitus adinventas. Si enim sunt legitimi quoad Deum secundum legem suam scilicet legem gracie, tunc sunt vere legitimi."

[3] "Ideo in libello de triplici amoris loquitur isto modo." Hus might also have referred to endeavours made in his own land to introduce the employment of the (Czech) mother tongue in place of the Latin in theological matters; comp. my essay on "Adalbertus Ranconis de Ericinio," in vol. lvii. of the *Archiv f. öst. Gesch.*, 223.

[4] See above, p. 248. It is more probable that the passage was borrowed from this tractate.

sancta ecclesia catholica sit insuperabilis . . tamen infideles circumpalpitant pro arguciis inpugnantibus istam fidem. Clamant enim, quod curia Romana . . . impugnat istam viam . . . et sic iuxta distinccionem famosam aliud est esse de ista ecclesia et aliud est esse in illa; de illa autem est pars predestinata ad gloriam, sed in illa est prescitus ad dampnacionem perpetuam et sic pars illius ecclesie gerit filios gehenne ac filios patrie, sicut pars illius ecclesie, a qua est genita naturaliter, et alia genita est de illis, totam tamen hanc sanctam ecclesiam credimus, quod spiritualiter sit genita de Deo per graciam, et per istas distincciones et similes

See Hus, *Opera* I. 199 *b*, 204 *a*:

". . . et sic aliud est esse de ecclesia aliud esse in ecclesia."

The farther arguments, with some modifications, see Hus, fol. 200 *b*, 203 *b*.

. . . .

". . . Hic[1] dicitur, quod ecclesia multis modis sumitur: scilicet vere et reputative; nuncupative notatur ecclesia prescitorum congregacio, licet ex nudo errore viancium fuerit de sancta matre ecclesia reputata, et sic multi secundum famam seculi vocantur ecclesie capita vel membra ecclesie, licet sint membra diaboli, quia ad tempus credunt . . . et semper fuerunt infideles. Et ista potest esse ecclesia malignancium imprope vel ecclesia antichristi, licet nunquam fuerunt de sancta matre ecclesia. Et sicut de sancta matre ecclesia possunt homines dupliciter esse vel pure ex gracia pre-

Opera, 1, 205 *a*:

" Hic dicitur, quod ecclesia sumitur vere et reputative vel nuncupative . . . nuncupative vocatur ecclesia eciam prescitorum congregacio, licet ex nudo errore viancium fuerit de sancta matre ecclesia reputata, et sic multi secundum famam seculi vocantur ecclesie capita vel membra, licet . . . sunt membra diaboli, que ad tempus credunt . . . et semper sunt infideles" . . .

Ib., 200 *a*:

". . . Et patet ulterius, quod dupliciter homines possunt esse de sancta matre

[1] Comp. above, pp. 199—201.

destinacionis, a qua nemo potest excidere . . . et patet solucio. Nam gracia predestinacionis facit filios ecclesie, quam nemo potest perdere sed solum pro instanti sue incepcionis adquirere. Sed preter istam graciam predestinacionis est dare graciam vel caritatem adventuram, que nunc accidit et nunc excidit, et prior gracia facit quodammodo infinitum perfecciorem hominem quam secunda. Ideo prior facit membra ecclesie, sed secunda facit Deo acceptos officiarios temporales. Et patet, quod nimis particulariter arguitur, ut peccatum finalis inpenitencie predestinacioni oppositum privat subiectum de sancta matre ecclesia, sicut virtus predestinacionis ponit hominem esse de illa. Et ita videtur probabile, quod sicut Paulus fuit simul blasphemus et de sancta ecclesia et cum hoc fidelis atque in gracia: sic Scarioth fuit simul in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam et nunquam de sancta matre ecclesia, cum defuit sibi quecunque virtus, quam oportet infundi . . .

"Et sic Scarioth licet fuit apostolus, quod est nomen officii, nunquam tamen fuit de ecclesia, sicut Paulus nunquam fuit membrum diaboli, licet fecit quosdam actus actibus ecclesie malignancium consimiles sed in malicia quoad ipsum Paulum atque ecclesiam minores. Nam in talia peccata dicit Augustinus quod expedit predestinatos incidere" . . .

ecclesia . . . vel secundum predestinacionem . . . a qua preordinatus non potest finaliter excidere.

". . . quia nunc accidit et nunc excidit: Et prima gracia facit filios s. ecclesie universalis et facit hominem quodammodo in infinitum perfecciorem quam secunda. Et prima facit filios hereditatis, sed secunda facit Deo acceptos officiales temporales.

"Unde videtur esse probabile, quod sicut Paulus fuit simul blasphemus . . . et de sancta matre ecclesia et cum hoc fidelis atque in gracia: sic Scarioth fuit simul in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam et nunquam de sancta matre ecclesia, cum defuit sibi illa predestinacio.

"Et sic Scarioth licet fuit apostolus vel episcopus a Christo electus, quod est nomen officii, nunquam tamen fuit pars sancte universalis ecclesie, sicut Paulus nunquam fuit membrum diaboli, licet fecit quosdam actus actibus ecclesie malignancium consimiles . . . nam in peccata talia ut dicit Augustinus expedit predestinatos incidere . . ."

7.—Wiclif, "De imaginibus."

In the tractate *De imaginibus*, which is to be found in the MS. X. E. 9 of the Prague University Library, Wiclif deals with the adoration of saints. He discovers ten truths, on which he speaks in the same number of sections. This tractate manifestly gave rise to that of Hus, which of a truth in important points agrees verbally with Wiclif's tractate. Let any one compare:—

Wiclif:

"Secunda veritas declaranda talis est in forma: Non licet adorare imaginem salvatoris latria. Probatur hoc sic: Non licet alicui adorare imaginem salvatoris adoracione sibi indebita. Cum ergo omnis latria est adoracio indebita imagini salvatoris, sequitur veritas probanda. Minor sic arguitur: Omnis latria est adoracio soli Deo debita, nulla adoracio soli Deo debita debetur imagini salvatoris, cum nulla talis imago sit salvator, ergo minor probanda. Item eo ipso, quod quis adorat aliquid latria, confitetur illud essencialiter esse deum. Ergo si licet alicui adorare imaginem salvatoris latria, licet ei confiteri imaginem essè essencialiter deum. Et cum eo ipso, quod[1] talis imago est, ipsa est essencia, iterum aliud a Deo sequitur, quod licet ei confiteri aliud a Deo esse deum.

Hus, *Opera*, ii., 341 *b*:

"Conclusio secunda: Non licet adorare imaginem salvatoris latria. Probatur: Non licet alicui adorare imaginem adoracione sibi indebita. Et quia omnis latria est adoracio indebita imagini salvatoris, sequitur veritas probanda. Minor arguitur sic: Omnis adoracio latrie est soli Deo debita, nulla adoracio soli Deo debita debetur imagini salvatoris, cum nulla talis imago est salvator. Ergo minor vera. Item eo ipso, quod quis adorat latria, confitetur essencialiter illud esse deum. Ergo si licet alicui adorare imaginem salvatoris latria, licet ei confiteri imaginem talem essencialiter esse deum.

[1] *In cod.*, *quo*; so also infra.

"Item omnis licita adoracio imaginis salvatoris est dulia, nulla dulia est latria, ergo nulla licita adoracio imaginis salvatoris est latria. Patet consequencia cum minori et assumptum est per hoc, quod omnis licita adoracio imaginis salvatoris est adoracio debita creature."

"Item: Omnis licita adoracio imaginis salvatoris est dulia, nulla dulia est latria. Ergo nulla licita adoracio imaginis salvatoris est latria. Patet". . .

It must not be overlooked that the whole question is by Wiclif grasped and treated much more in principle, and at the same time also regarded on its practical side. Accordingly that which Hus wrote under the title *De imaginibus*, is to be looked upon only as an excerpt from the tractate of Wiclif. The ten truths of Wiclif are of the following tenour: 1, "Non omne adorandum est natura racionalis eius pars vel eius accidens." 2, "Non licet adorare imaginem salvatoris latria." 3, "Non licet adorare imaginem salvatoris latria, sed quod est dulia." 4, "Supposita tam excellenti figuracione in libris clericorum ad figurandum sanctos cum eorum gestis laudabilibus sicut imaginibus sanctorum, que vocantur libri laicales, tam excellenter adorandi sunt a fidelibus dicti libri, quam excellenter adorande sunt a fidelibus dicte imagines." 5, "Non eo ipso, quod res est incorporea, est illicitum ei facere imaginem corpoream, imaginem ad ipsam fideliter representandam." 6, "Nullus Christianus tenetur per dimissionem debite adoracionis imaginem sanctorum dare exemplum ad dimittendum suam idolatriam." 7, "Non eo ipso, quod imago sancti habet supernaturalem virtutem ad sanandum infirmos, est ipsa plus adoranda quam est imago eiusdem sancti, si fuerit,

que non habet huiusmodi virtutem," etc. 8, "Non eo ipso, quod unum signum Dei est alio signo perfeccius in racione rei, est ipsum signum plus eo alio signo a fidelibus adorandum." 9, "Nemo debet propter amorem peregrinandi ad ecclesias extraneas sive ad extranea loca, in quibus sunt imagines sanctorum, subtrahere peregrinacionem, quam debet facere ad ecclesiam suam propriam." 10, "A quocunque subelemosinario suo prefecto ab eis per ministerium episcopi notorie abutente suis oblacionibus peregrini possunt subtrahere officium ipsum" . . .

8.—Wiclif, "Responsio ad argumenta cuiusdam emuli veritatis."

Cod. un. Prag., X.E.9, 160.

"Scio tamen, quod heretici possunt tam sinistre intelligere hoc verbum ewangelicum: Super hanc petram edificabo ecclesiam meam quod Christus per hoc intenderit, quod super personam Petri edificaret totam ecclesiam militantem. Sed fides ewangelii cum exposicione Augustini et racio contradicunt. Nam super petram, que est Christus, a qua Petrus accepit firmitatem, fuit Christus edificaturus suam ecclesiam, cum Christus sit caput et fundamentum tocius ecclesie sed non Petrus.

". . . Et fundant se super ista mendosa interpretacione, quod Cephas interpretatur caput . . . Et Jeronymus peritus linguarum dicit, quod

Hus, *De eccl.*, cap. ix.:

"Sed quod ex isto verbo ewangelii: Super hanc petram edificabo ecclesiam meam, Christus intenderit super personam Petri edificare totam ecclesiam militantem, fides ewangelii cum exposicione Augustini et racio contradicunt.

"Nam super petram, que est Christus, a quo Petrus accepit firmitatem, fuit Christus edificaturus suam ecclesiam, cum Christus sit caput et fundamentum tocius ecclesie sed non Petrus . . .

". . . Unde Hieronymus peritus linguarum dicit

Cephas interpretatur Petrus vel firmitas et Syrum est et non Hebreum."	quod Cephas interpretatur Petrus vel firmitas et Syrum est non Hebreum."

The same explanation is, as is well known, given by Wiclif in his tractate *De Christo et adversario suo Antichristo* likewise,[1] of which a passage has been cited in evidence above. But when we compare the passages of Hus with those of Wiclif, we find that for these points he has availed himself of the tractate, *Responsio ad argumenta cuiusdam emuli veritatis.* In particular the last paragraphs here brought into juxtaposition are entirely decisive upon this question. While in the *Responsio* and in Hus Jerome is characterised as "peritus linguarum," this designation is altogether wanting in the tractate *De Christo et suo adversario Antichristo.*

9.—Wiclif, "De officio regis."

Conclusio De officio regis. Cod. Pal. Vindob. 4527, fol. 146 *a*:	*Opera*, ii., 47 *a*:
"Rex debet ex vi sui officii defendere legem Dei per potestatem coactivam, compellere rebellantes et in regno suo destruere legi domini adversantes. Et qui resistunt in isto regibus, voluntati domini resistunt secundum apostolum. Et istud executus est sapiens rex Salomon in veteri testamento deponendo summum pontificem, ut patet 3. Reg. 2 de Abiathar depositio et Sadoc summo sacerdote, quem posuit loco sui. Hoc autem fuit maius quam auferre	"Rex debet ex vi sui officii defendere legem Dei per potestatem coactivam, compellere rebellantes et in regno suo destruere legi Dei adversantes. "Et qui resistunt in isto regibus, voluntati domini resistunt secundum apostolum Rom. 13. Et istud executus est rex sapiens Salomon in veteri testamento . . . ". . . Hoc autem fuit magis quam auferre temporalia ab

[1] Cap. 5, ed. Buddenseig, p. 39; cf. *supra*, p. 215.

temporalia ab episcopo, quod et fecit. Et propter hoc fuit Salomon rex pacificus et regnum suum in virtute domini prosperatum. Et propter istud triplex officium, quod rex debet solvere deo suo, Deus regi retribuit triplex bonum scilicet prosperitatem mundanam et seculi potestatem, honorificenciam mundi eciam a suo precipuo sacerdote et finaliter beatitudinem secundum gradum, quo fideliter servivit Deo suo."

episcopis, quod et fecit. Et propter hoc fuit Salomon rex pacificus et regnum suum in virtute domini prosperatum. Et propter istud triplex officium, quod rex debet solvere deo suo, Deus regi tribuit triplex bonum scilicet prosperitatem mundanam et seculi potestatem, honorificenciam mundi eciam a suo precipuo sacerdote et finaliter beatitudinem secundum gradum, quo fideliter servivit Deo suo."

This is, for the rest, one of the few passages in which Hus has expressly mentioned his source. "Hec est," — he says, in the synodal discourse delivered by him in June 1411,—"Conclusio magistri Joannis Wiclef de officio regis." A second time Hus refers to these arguments of Wiclif, in the tractate *De ablacione temporalium a clero*; cf. *Opera*, i., fol. 118 *a*.

Cod. pal. Vind. 3933, fol. 63: "Et cum guerre et pugne sint licite ac meritorie, ut docetur clare, quomodo et quare seculare brachium dominari debeat vel pugnare, quantum ad illud sepe dixi, quod licet pugnare . . . propter caritatem habendam ad dominum et proximum eciam debellandum et aliter non. Unde cum n clero sit tanta ignorancia legis Dei, tanta candens cupiditas honoris seculi et secularis dominii, consulendum videtur dominos, quod non credant clero suo, qui sic eos hortatur et consulit nude ad pugnandum,

The thought to which Wiclif here gives utterance, that it is permitted to the secular arm to fight, "propter caritatem habendam ad dominum," is met with likewise in Hus in numerous places, and in such connection that an employment of Wiclif's thesis seems beyond doubt; thus, *e.g.*,

Hus, *Opera*, i., 176 *b*: "... licet seculari brachio pugnare ... habitis condicionibus caritatis" ...

sed opera perfectorum aspiciant, qui ex fide scripture et spe maioris premii gaudenter paciuntur iniurias."

Cf. *Ib.*, fol. 314 *b*:
"Patet ex prima belli condicione, cum nemo debet alium impugnare nisi ex fraterna caritate" . . .

10.—Wiclif, "Tractatus de prevaricacione."

Cod. pal. Vind., 3929, fol. 193 *a*:
"Sic capta completa descripcione pape ex cunctis circumstanciis quas pretendit planum est, quod nullus prelatus huiusmodi debet esse. Et quantum ad istud Math. 16. dictum Petro: Tibi dabo claves regni celorum. Patet, quod in persona Petri fuit dictum toti ecclesie militanti: Non quod quelibet persona illius ecclesie indifferenter habeat illas claves, sed quod tota illa ecclesia secundum singulas eius partes ad hoc habiles habeat illas claves. Ille autem claves non sunt materiales ligandi vel solvendi corpus aliquod sed spiritualis potestas et noticia sciencie ewangelice et propter istam potestatem atque noticiam creditur, quod Christus pluraliter nominat ipsas claves."

Hus, *De ecclesia*, cap. x. *Opera*, fol. 214 *a*:
". . . Unde cum Christus dicit Petro: Tibi dabo claves regni celorum . . . in persona Petri dixit toti ecclesie militanti: non quod quelibet persona illius ecclesie indifferenter habeat illas claves, sed quod tota illa ecclesia secundum singulas eius partes ad hoc habiles habeat illas claves. Ille autem claves non sunt materiales sed spiritualis potestas et noticia sciencie ewangelice et propter istam potestatem et noticiam creditur, quod Christus pluraliter nominat ipsas claves."

11.—The Tractate "De citacionibus frivolis."

Cod. Univ. Prag., X. E. 9, fol. 151 *b*:
". . . Christus non citavit tortores, ut ipsum crucient et occidant, sed venit illuc humiliter . . . Petrus eciam urbane vocatus a Cornelio non citatus venit ad eum."

Hus, *De ecclesia*, cap. xxi.:
"Pensarent utinam vitam exemplarem Christi pontificis, qui pie errantes . . . visitavit non citando, non incarcerando non excommunicando"

12.—"Questio de absolucione a pena et a culpa."

(*Cod. Univ. Prag.*, III., G. 11, 263.)

In addition to the lengthy passage of which mention has been made in the foregoing pages, the following may be further noted here :—

"Sed mercenarii sunt non pastores et ideo, cum sint presciti, non habent oves proprias neque . . . Revera . . . nulli datur absolucio, nisi quem Deus eternaliter predestinavit ad beatitudinem taliter premiari.

"Sed numquid papa propter causam tam reprobam hoc concedit? Si ergo subintellecta ista condicione papa concedit has indulgencias, posset et concedere subintellecta consimili condicione, que nichil ponit nisi naturam divinam quamlibet esse deum" . . .

Opera, i., 182 *a* :

"Nulli datur absolucio nisi illi, quem Deus eternaliter predestinavit ad beatitudinem taliter premiari.

"Sed numquid papa propter causam tam reprobam hoc concedit? Si ergo subintellecta illa condicione papa concedit has indulgencias et pollicetur, possit eciam concedere subintellecta condicione, que nichil ponit nisi naturam divinam quamlibet esse deum" . . .

In Wiclif's *Sermones*, moreover (*Cod. Univ. Prag.*, III., G. 11., 139 *b*), a few passages are to be met with, which have passed over into the works of Hus :—

"Tres virtutes catholice sunt necessarie viatori, cum fundamentum vite virtuose viantis sit fides tamquam substancia firma . . ."

Hus, *De ecclesia*, fol. 208 *b* :

". . . Proprietas fidei est, quod est fundamentum viatori veniendi ad quietam habitacionem credendorum . . ."

13.—Wiclif, "De civili dominio."

In Wiclif's tractate *De ecclesia*, cap. xii., Hus found the notice that John, Duke of Lancaster, was the

protector of Wiclif. In that treatise there is to be seen, beside the indication of his title, "Dux protector Magistri Johannis," an observation of Wiclif's bearing upon this relation. Hus made reference to the fact in his controversial writing against the Englishman John Stokes.

The famous letter of Grossetête, Bishop of Lincoln, which was intended for Innocent IV., if not actually addressed to him,[1] and in which the Bishop declares that a faithful and devoted subject of the Holy See can render no obedience to certain commands, was known also to Hus. He has produced the text of it in his tractate *De ecclesia* (in cap. xviii., fol. 236 *a*), and repeatedly appeals to it in other places. Thus also in his answer to the writing of the eight doctors (*Opera*, i. 303 *b*) he adduces the main proposition of the said letter in support of his reasoning, "Mandatis apostolicis affeccione filiali omnino et devote et reverenter obedio. His vero que mandatis apostolicis adversantur paternum zelans honorem adversor et obsto. Ad utrumque in racione filiacionis teneor ex divino mandato. Apostolica quidem mandata non sunt nec esse possunt quam apostolice doctrine et ipsius domini Jesu Christi apostolorum magistri."

The letter of the Bishop of Lincoln is to be read in the 43rd chapter of Wiclif's treatise *De civili dominio* (*Cod.* 1341 of the Imperial Library at Vienna). This treatise must have enjoyed great popularity in

[1] On Grossetête and Innocent IV., and specially on this letter, see the further data in Lechler, *l.c.* i., 198. I am indebted to Lechler's book for my knowledge of the matter; the tractate of Wiclif in question, *De civili dominio*, being accessible to me only after the composition of the above text.

Bohemia, for it is found, included with a series of other writings of Wiclif, in the condemnation made by Archbishop Zbinco of Prague, of the 16th June, 1410.[1]

[1] *Documenta Magistri Joannis Hus*, 380; *vid. supra*, p. 115.

CHAPTER IX.

WICLIFISM IN THE LAST WRITINGS OF HUS.

The "Sermones dominicales" of Wiclif, and Hus' tractate "De pace."

WHILE in the preceding sections of chapter viii. a whole series of Wiclif's views has been advanced, whether in the form of more lengthy dissertations or briefer enunciations of doctrine, which Hus has, either with verbal fidelity or with slight alterations, adopted as his intellectual property, it must yet be designated as the most remarkable thing that Hus purposed to deliver before the assembled fathers at the council—as his own—a sermon which in reality belonged not to himself, but to Wiclif.[1] It is the well-known sermon *De Pace* (Hus, *Opera*, i. 52 *a* sqq.). This agrees in by far the greater part word for word with a sermon which is to be found in Wiclif's collection of discourses, the *Sermones dominicales*, under the title *Pax vobis*

[1] Assuming that the notice to the Nuremburg edition of Hus' works of the year 1558 has a foundation of truth when it says that Hus intended to deliver this sermon at the Council. There is, however, no reason for doubting the accuracy of the notice in question, which was already to be found in an ancient MS. The edition of 1558, so far as it contains genuine works of Hus, proves tolerably correct.

Johannis, 20°.[1] Inasmuch as this circumstance is of extraordinary importance for the characterising of Hus in general, and more particularly the position he takes towards the writings of Wiclif, it will appear justified if here for the last time passages are cited at large for the comparison of the texts :—

Wiclif, *Sermones dominicales. Cod. palat. Vindobon.*, 3932, fol. 125 *b* :

"Duobus modis solet Christus dicere verba thematis scilicet per viam salutacionis et per viam legacionis.

"Constat ex evangelio Luce 24 et Johannis 20, quomodo Christus salutavit post resurreccionem discipulos verbis pacificis . . . patet quomodo Christus die cene legavit filiis suis et carissimis in sua finali licencia pacem tamquam iocale maximum . . .

"Est autem duplex pax scilicet Dei et pax mundi . . .

"Tantam autem vim habet pax, quod omnes homines naturaliter ipsam appetunt, cum gracia illius sunt omnia bella, que forent frustra, nisi ille finis sequeretur. Ad tantum eciam est pax necessaria quod eciam latrones appetunt inter se pacem, cum aliter dissolveretur eorum consorcium. Et sic contendunt homines ad habendum pacifice sua. Sic humanum corpus, sic omne mixtum et activum alteri contrarium salvatur in

Hus, *De pace.* (*Sermo quem intendebat predicare in Const. concilio.*) *Opera*, 1, 52 *a* :

"Redemptor . . . duobus modis pacem discipulis obtulit, primo modo legacionis . . . secundo modo salutacionis . . .

"Sepius post resurreccionem ipsos verbis pacificis salutat dicens Luce 24 et Johannis 20 . . . die cene legavit ut filiis suis carissimis in sua ante mortem finali licencia pacem tamquam maximum donarium.

"Est autem duplex pax scilicet pax Dei et pax mundi . . .

"Hec autem pax tantam habet vim, quod omnes homines naturaliter ipsam desiderant, cum propter illam sunt omnia bella, que forent frustra nec ille finis sequeretur . . . Immo tantum est hominibus pax desiderabilis, quod eciam latrones inter se pacem appetunt cum aliter dissolveretur eorum consorcium. Et sic contendunt homines ad habendum pacifice sua. Sic humanum corpus, sic omne mixtum et

[1] The *Sermones dominicales* are to be found in the *Codex palatinus Vindobonensis* 3932, fol. 125 *b*.

quadam pace, concordia vel connivencia, quam Empedokles vocat amiciciam, que est causa generacionis, sicut lis est causa corrupcionis.

"Differunt autem pax Dei et pax mundi in hoc, quod pax dei semper est in dei benevolencia auctorizata, in bono virtutis fundata et amicicia angelorum ornata, ad quam consequitur mundi dominium et securitas a cunctis hostibus.

"Pax vero mundi fundatur in applausu humano communiter sophistico inter paucos subdoles et fragiles ligamento carnali vel seculari confederatos. Ideo ad istam pacem non formaliter sequitur aliquod verum dominium vel securitas ab hostibus sed pocius fraus atque illusio. Ideo Johannis 14° signanter dicit Christus: Pacem relinquo vobis . . .

"Christus enim quandocunque dat pacem suam, primo omnium dat se ipsum et per consequens omnia bona mundi, ex quibus sequitur securitas, cum omnia creata serviunt sic pacificato.

"Habens igitur pacem[1] tam fortem confidenter habet securitatem. Ideo adiungit Christus: Non turbetur cor vestrum neque formidet.

"Quis igitur timeret videndo hostem invalidum se ipsum proprio iaculo prosteractivum alteri contrarium salvatur in quadam pace, concordia vel connivenica, quam Empedokleś vocat amiciciam, que est causa generacionis, sicut lis est causa corrupcionis.

Differencie pacis.

". . . differt tamen a pace Dei . . . primo in hoc, quod pax dei semper est in dei benevolencia firmata, in virtutibus fundata et angelorum amicicia ornata, ad quam consequitur mundi dominium et securitas ab omnibus hostibus.

Pax vero mundi fundatur in applausu humano communiter sophistico inter paucos fragiles confederatos debiliter seculi ligamento. Ideo ad istam pacem non formaliter sequitur aliquod verum dominium nec securitas ab hostibus sed pocius fraus atque illusio. Ideo Johannis 14° signanter dicit Christus: Pacem relinquo vobis . . .

"Christus enim quandocunque dat pacem suam . . . primo omnium dat se ipsum et per consequens omnia bona mundi, ex quibus sequitur securitas, cum omnia creata serviunt pacificato homini in Deo. Habens igitur pacem tam fortem habet confidencie securitatem. Ideo adiungit Christus: Non turbetur cor vestrum neque formidet.

"Quis enim . . . formidaret et videndo hostem invalidum se ipsum vulnerantem et pro-

[1] In *Cod.*: "*partem.*"

nentem et vulnerantem nec non et ipsum quem insultat erigentem ac arma decorata stabilientem? Sic est de omni christiano persecuto avido, et in ista firmitate fidei certarunt omnes martyres, ut sepe dictum est. Unde bulliente maiori persecucione corporis in nitendo hiis armis fidei et charitative paciencie pullulat christiano maior securitas, vita iocundior.

"Ex quibus correlarie colligitur, quod nimis ceca foret mundana stulticia, relinquere caput ecclesie, quod est caput universitatis, postponendo pacem suam et preeligendo pacem seculi. Amara quidem stulticia et ingrata foret delinquere [sic] Deum: maledictus enim, qui sic confidit hominem. Est autem accessus ad primum dominum semper liberior, acquisicio pacis sue facilior et retencio pacis (in) infinitum eligibilior omnino securior. Nam quilibet christianus potest loqui cum domino in omni hora tamquam patre, fratre et coherede, et hoc confortat pios ad diligendum eum assidue.

"Empcio autem dicte pacis stat in bona voluntate Christiani ut ipse[1] (?) causa. Voluntas autem illa est facillima volenti et securitas. Ex hoc patet; quod pax illa solum dependet a Deo immobili et pacificati bona voluntate.

sternentem iaculo proprio nec non et ipsum quem insultat erigentem ac arma decorata stabilientem? . . . Sic est de omni Christi milite pugnante . . . et isto pensato Christi martyres penas atroces et varias moriendo devicerunt. Unde bulliente maiori persecucione in fine seculi . . . in hiis armis fidei et in charitativa paciencia pullulat Christi militi maior securitas, vita iocundior . . .

"Ex quibus colligitur, quod nimis ceca foret mundana stulticia, relinquere caput ecclesie dominum Jesum Christum, qui est universitatis dominus, postponendo pacem suam et preeligendo pacem seculi. Amara quidem stulticia et ingrata foret relinquere Deum et confidere in homine, cum accessus ad Deum est semper liberior, acquisicio pacis sue facilior et retencio pacis sue omnino securior et in infinitum eligibilior. Nam quilibet christianus potest loqui cum Christo omni hora tamquam cum patre piissimo, cum fratre prestantissimo, et cum coherede fidelissimo, et hoc confortat pios ad assidue exorandum. Empcio autem pacis Dei stat in bona voluntate hominis, ut in per se causa. Voluntas autem volentis est facillima securitas. Et ex hoc patet, quod pax illa solum dependet a Deo immobili et a pacificati hominis bona voluntate."

[1] *Recte: i(n) p(er) se.*

"Pax illa inseparabiliter adiacet, ut dicit angelus Luc. 1°. Ideo numquam amittitur ab homine nisi velit. Alia autem pax perdit(ur) ab invito nec oportet declarare infinitatem excessus pacis Dei super pacem seculi, quia prior est per se bona et sufficiens. Infinite autem paces seculi non equivalent minime paci Dei, cum quelibet earum est insufficiens, instabilis et inquieta. Insufficiens, quia non valet nisi in virtute pacis dei, instabilis, quia dependet a flexibilitate multarum voluntatum peccancium a diabolo et mundo, et cum quilibet appetit veram pacem."

"Et patet, quod pax Dei differt secundo a pace mundi in hoc, quod pax dei numquam amittitur ab homine nisi velit, pax autem mundi amittitur ab invito. Tercio differt in hoc, quia pax Dei est per se bona et sufficiens, pax vero mundi est insufficiens, inquieta et instabilis. Insufficiens, quia non valet sine pace dei, instabilis, quia dependet a flexibilitate multarum voluntatum peccancium. Unde infinite paces seculi non aequivalent minime paci dei."

As regards the remaining parts of Hus' sermon *De pace*, there are to be found single details in a second sermon of Wiclif's, *De pace* (*Cod. un. Prag.* iii. G. 11). The tractate *De septem donis spiritus sancti*, as also that *De religion. van. monachorum*, likewise contain notes of accord with the reasonings of Hus.

The evidence of the above quotations leads to the result, that in the composition of his discourse Hus availed himself in the first line of the *Sermones dominicales* of Wiclif. If we examine more closely we find a free use made of the tractates *De Christo et suo adversario Antichristo*, *De ecclesia*, and the *Trialogus;* so that we must say: the tractate *De pace*, which Hus had the intention of delivering at the council, is a more or less skilful compilation from four books of Wiclif's. Hus repeats therein much that he has already presented in his tractate

on the Church. Notably the celebrated letter of Robert Grossetête plays, here too, a conspicuous part.

Not otherwise is it with the second discourse, which in like manner he wished to deliver before the Council: *De fidei sue elucidacione.* The idea of faith, the doctrine of the Church, its unity, universality, organisation, etc., all this is said in Wiclif's words.

The same holds good, finally, of the last tractate, by which he was desirous of proving to the Council that the law of Christ (*i.e.* Holy Scripture) suffices for the government of the Church: *De sufficiencia legis Christi ad regendam ecclesiam.* Some few proof passages on this point have already been cited above.

That, accordingly, which Hus intended to deliver at the Council, before the assembled fathers, was nothing else but Wiclify pure and unadulterated.

CHAPTER X.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE HUSSITE DOCTRINE IN ITS RELATION TO WICLIF.

THE numerous evidential passages in the foregoing chapters have made clear to demonstration the employment of Wiclif's writings by Hus, and the manner of their use. We should, however, indulge in a delusion if we were to suppose that with this proof the subject is even to some extent exhausted. Fully to dispose of it will be the task of those who are occupied with the editing of Hus' writings. In the proof material of the above pages the aim is to present only specimens, which may be augmented in very considerable number by any one who applies himself to the study of Wiclif's writings and those of Hus. There are yet points enough in which Hus has appropriated word for word the arguments of Wiclif: in his doctrine of the sources of the Christian Belief, of the Church and its constitution, thus also of the papacy and the priestly order; in his doctrine of Church government, the doctrine of Predestination and its consequences, of sin and the influence thereof upon the civil and ecclesiastical institutions; in the doctrine of the Sacraments—the doctrine of the Supper

perhaps excepted, but this doctrine of Wiclif too, was, as is well-known, obstinately imputed to him by his numerous opponents—in his Eschatology, his conceptions with regard to the National Church, if people will so think of the *Ecclesia particularis*; and, finally, in all his very seriously meant endeavours for the raising and amendment of the ecclesiastical conditions in his native land, he is a thorough disciple of Wiclif. That which the latter relates of the state of affairs in England; the struggle there against the evil ecclesiastical conditions and regulations—all this he transfers to the circumstances of Bohemia. As we have seen in the above proof passages of the fifth chapter, he contented himself for the most part with substituting a *Boemia* in the place where Wiclif writes *Anglia*, or transforming the *rex Anglorum* into a *rex Boemorum*. We may observe, particularly in the first eight chapters of his tractate, *Of the Church*, that he has frequently made his appropriations chapter-wise. Often, it is true, it is only single theses of Wiclif which are met with in Hus; but in this case it is always doctrinal theses, definitions, which he borrows from him; as, *e.g.*, in the tractate *De Trinitate*, the well-known protestation is taken word for word from a philosophical tractate of Wiclif. Nay, if one takes into consideration the great number of definitions which Hus transcribes word for word from Wiclif,—of the Church, Faith, the Indulgence, Sacraments, Heresy, etc.,—one might easily be led to the belief that, with the exception of the Bible and some few of the Fathers, Hus consulted in his theological studies no other sources than those of Wiclif only. Of these

definitions single additional ones are furnished as specimens in this concluding chapter. To these a few reflections may be appended, from which it will become apparent how on the most vital questions Hus attached himself to the lessons of the English teacher. We shall, moreover, be able to recognise the influence of Wiclif even on those points whereon Hus has hitherto been regarded as independent of Wiclif. In the first line we may examine his views as to the sources of the Christian Belief, and as to the so-called imperialising of the Church; in the second line, his doctrine regarding the Sacrament of the Altar.[1]

As regards Hus' doctrine concerning the sources of the Christian Belief and concerning its exposition, it may be taken as proved that Holy Scripture was looked upon by him as the alone source of religious truth, despite the fact that in several places he expressed himself in another sense. In his controversy with Stephen Paleczhe did, it is true, characterise as the first lie which was imputed to him,[2] that he made Holy Scripture alone the sole rule of faith; and elsewhere, particularly in his tractate on the

[1] The book of Lenz has furnished the proof—in opposition to the opinions of various authors, who maintain that Hus did not deviate from the standard of the Roman Catholic Church—that Hus in a series of doctrines forsakes the dogma of the Catholic Church. But only of that Church which has fixed and formulated its doctrines in the Tridentinum, which notably had not been done at the time of the Council of Constance. See on the other hand the judgment of Lechler, *l.c.*, ii. 227. "The question is only whether Hus was really convicted of a heresy. And to this we answer decidedly, *No.*"

[2] *De ecclesia*, cap. xvi., *Opera*, i. 227 *a*; see also *De fidei elucidacione*, *Opera*, i. 48 *b*.

sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, written at Constance, he says: "I believe with the Holy Mother Church every authentic truth, as the blessed Trinity wishes it to be believed, and hold fast to the decisions of the general councils and teachers of the Church, as well explicite as implicite." These assurances, nevertheless, possess only the value of a mental reservation.[1] Passages in which he acknowledges the sole authority of Scripture are of frequent occurrence as well in his tractates as in his sermons and letters.[2] In this conviction, which he had written, taught, and preached, he declared himself also in his last moments ready to go to the stake.[3]

In this doctrine, too, Hus accordingly remains loyal to Wiclif: as the latter repeatedly asserted that the Scripture suffices in itself for the guidance of the Church, so Hus also has written a particular tractate on this subject: "On the sufficiency of the law of Christ for the guidance of the Church." The law of God, says Hus, is that which stands expressly written in Holy Scripture; in a wider sense, however, every true law which is in any way contained in Holy Scripture. And as Wiclif says, we may believe neither the deed, nor the word, nor even the bulls of this pope, save in so far as this is grounded on Scripture, or "if there were a hundred popes, and all the fratres were transformed into cardinals,"[4] one

[1] The proofs see in Lenz: *Učení mistra Jana Husi*, 4 sqq.
[2] The connection is found with Böhringer, *l.c.* 583 sqq.; Lechler, ii. 234; Lenz, *Učení*.
[3] "In ea veritate evangelii, quam scripsi docui et predicavi . . . hodie letanter volo mori." *Doc. mag. Joh. Hus*, 323.
[4] *Trialogus*, 266.

could not obey their dictum in matters of faith, except inasmuch as it was founded on Scripture, so we shall find in Hus' works passages of pretty similar import. Compare—

Wiclif, *De officio pastorali*, c. xii. :

"Et ad istud sepe dictum est, quod confirmacio Romani pontificis non valet, nisi de quanto voluntati et ordinacioni Dei qui est summus dominus est conformis. Nec est fides cum sepe contingit oppositum, quod quidquid fecerit papa, Deus . . . auctorisat, cum tunc esset impeccabilis et deus in terris . . . Ideo cum non debet sibi credi, nisi de quanto ex fide scripture vel mandato domini se fundaverit . . . Et breviter nec facto suo nec dicto vel bullis debent fideles credere istius prelati, nisi de quanto se fundaverit in fide scripture . . ."

Hus, *De ecclesia*, 209 *a*, cap. viii. :

". . . Et isto modo tenetur quilibet christianus credere explicite vel implicite omnem veritatem, quam sanctus spiritus posuit in scriptura. Et isto modo non tenetur homo dictis sanctorum preter scripturam nec bullis papalibus credere, nisi quod dixerint ex scriptura vel quod fundaretur impliciter in scriptura . . . Aliter ergo credimus Deo, qui nec falli nec fallere potest, aliter pape, qui falli et fallere potest . . . nam scripture sacre nec licet discredere nec licet contradicere, sed bullis aliquando licet et discredere et contradicere . . ."

Trialogus, 3. 31, pag. 239.

"Unde scripta aliorum doctorum . . . nec sunt credenda, nisi de quanto in scriptura domini essent fundata" . . . Cf. *Trial.* 240.

Cf., *De fidei sue elucidacione. Opp.*, 1. 49 *b*.

Comp. further, *Opera*, 294 *b*.

Dialogus.

"Ideo prudentes habent hanc consuetudinem . . . inprimis considerant, quid fides scripture loquatur in hoc puncto." See above, the whole reading of the text, p. 246.

Hus, *Opera*, 1. 187 *b* :

"Ideo prudentes hanc habent consuetudinem . . . inprimis considerant, quid fides scripture loquatur in hoc puncto . . ."

Wiclif, *De officio regis*:[1]
"Legifer noster Jesus Christus legem per se sufficientem dedit ad regimen tocius ecclesie militantis."

Hus, *Opera*, i., fol. 44 *b*—48 *a*:
"Lex Jesu Christi per se sufficit ad regimen ecclesie militantis."

Comp. *De Christo et adversario*, cap. xi.: "Cum lex sua sit per se sufficiens."

The definition of heresy Hus has likewise borrowed from Wiclif.

Wiclif, *Trialogus*, 379.
"Sciant inquam isti stulti antichristi discipuli, quod omnis error periculosus in materia fidei est heresis manifesta."

Hus, *Ad scriptum octo doctorum*, 305 *b*:
"Heresis quidem periculosa res est sed utilis valde."

Of Faith:
Wiclif, Sermons, cited from Lechler, Wiclif, 1. 524.
"Fides est fundamentum religionis, sine quo impossibile est placere Deo . . ."

Hus, *Opera*, i. 48 *b*:
De fidei sue elucidacione:
"Fundamentum igitur omnium virtutum, quo servitur Deo meritorie, est fides, sine qua impossibile est placere Deo."

De veritate s. scripture in Lechler, *ib.*:
". . . primum fundamentum virtutum est fides . . ."

Trialog., 3. 2. pag. 135:
". . . cum impossibile sit quemquam peccare, nisi in fide deficiat."

[1] Cited according to Lechler, *Johannes v. Wiclif*, i. 473, note 3.

Of Peace:
From the Sermones[1]
Cod. un. Prag., iii., G. 11, fol. 112:

"Rogate que ad pacem sunt Jerusalem . . Est autem pax mentis tranquillitas in virtutibus stabilita. Ex quo patet, quod omnis criminosus caret ut sic pace ecclesie . . . Nam pax, que est quietudo temporalium homini adiacencium, parturit communiter perturbacionem . . ."

Hus, *Sermo de pace.*
Opera, i., fol. 52 *a b*:

"Pax autem Dei est mentis tranquillitas in virtutibus stabilita. Ex quo patet, quod omnis homo existens in crimine caret ut sic ecclesie . . pace. Secunda pax . . . est quietudo temporalium homini adiacencium . . ."

In regard to the Supper, it is well-known that the doctrine of Hus does not accord with that of Wiclif.[2] Nevertheless we find in his tractate *De corpore Christi* certain points of resemblance with Wiclif's arguments in the *Trialogus*, so great indeed that we must suppose that he had subjected this tractate to a revision after becoming acquainted with Wiclif's writings. It is possible that his own arguments and those of Wiclif are traceable to a common source, as is also indicated by himself. This has reference notably to that distinction current from the time of Augustine,[3]—form, truth, and effect,—as the three things which one must hold fast in the Sacra-

[1] These discourses belong to Wiclif: the *Trialogus* is referred to in them, England repeatedly mentioned. Then again they are placed in the midst of Wiclif's tractates. Mention is also made in them by name of the tractate *De pœna et culpa*, which is to be found in the same MS.; see above, p. 275.

[2] *Vid.* Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vii. 1, 34; Lechler, ii. 252.

[3] "Ecce qualiter illa per Innocencium distinguuntur;" comp. *Decret. Gregor.* IX., lib. iii., tit. 41, cap. 6: "Quum Marthe." Here we have to seek the immediate source of Hus for the above

ment of the Altar; or sacrament and essence (=the Body of Christ), sacrament and not essence (= that sensuous object: the consecrated bread), essence and not sacrament (= the union of the members with Christ and with each other):

Wiclif, *Trialogus*, 248.

"Quamvis autem in hoc sacramento et ceteris sit trimembris distinccio, scilicet sacramentum et res, res et non sacramentum ac tercio sacramentum et non res. Oportet tamen, quod ista verba sint sane et congrue intellecta. Sacramentum autem et res dicitur corpus domini, quod est sursum. Dicitur autem sacramentum, quia est signum sensibile anime Christi deitatis et gracie. Ista autem res sensibilis descripta, que dicitur communiter panis sanctus, vocatur sacramentum et non res non ad istum sensum, quod non sit res aliqua, cum sit res satis sensibilis, uti videmus, sed ad istum sensum . . . Sed tercium membrum, quod est res et non sacramentum, vocatur graciaunionis Christi cum sua ecclesia . . ."

Hus, *Opera*, i.. 146 *b*:

". . . In sacramento altaris est dare tria scilicet sacramentum et non rem, ut est illud sensibile, sacramentum et rem, ut est corpus dominicum. Tercio rem et non sacramentum, ut est unio membrorum ecclesie, de quibus dicitur Extra. de celebracione missarum cap. Cum Marthe per Innocencium, quod distinguendum est subtiliter inter tria, que sunt in hoc sacramento discreta videlicet formam visibilem, veritatem corporis et sanguinis et virtutem spiritualem unionis et caritatis. Forma est panis et vini. Veritas carnis et sanguinis. Virtus unionis et charitatis . . . Primum est sacramentum et non res, id est non unio, etc. . . ."

A gaping contradiction will be found between the two tractates of Hus, that *De sacramento corporis et sanguinis domini* and that *De sanguine Christi*

presentation; besides this, however, Wiclifian influence is likewise apparent, see above, the words printed in spaced letters, which are not found in the decree. Comp. Böhringer, *l.c.*, 565.

sub specie vini a laicis sumendo. The second tractate belongs in point of time to an earlier date. Hus composed it before he was cast into prison. In this tractate he champions the view—on the basis of numerous testimonies of fathers and doctors—that it is profitable to believers to partake of the blood of the Lord under the form of wine. Yea, inasmuch as he adopts the decision of Pope Gelasius I., who straightway forbids the abstaining from the cup, and regards "the dividing of one and the same mystery as a great sacrilege," he goes even a step farther. He deduces from this decision two things: 1, that the sacrament is complete only under the twofold form of bread and wine; and 2, that he who partakes of the sacrament under one form only is guilty of a desecration (sacrilegium). The only limitation Hus admits, after Thomas de Aquino, is that one must be in a position to obtain wheat and wine. Both, however, in case they do not grow in a particular land, can easily be imported.

In the later tractate he not only says nothing of the profit brought by the partaking of the cup, but he also expresses himself to this effect: "Just as little is the body separate as the blood separate, but under both forms Christ remains whole, as the Church sings: therefore the body of Christ is under the species of the bread by transubstantiation of the bread into the body itself, but the blood is at the same time with it (concomitanter), and equally so the blood is under the species of the wine by transubstantiation of the wine into the blood, but the body is at the same time under this form." If one deduces the consequences of this proposition, one

comes naturally to the conclusion of the advantageousness of the Supper *sub una*, which accordingly is here indirectly conceded; whereas in the other tractate he speaks of the profitableness of the Supper *sub utraque*, nay even accentuates the obligation thereto ("debent").[1]

As concerns the sacrament of penitence, Hus notably holds the opinion that of the three main parts of the same—the contrition of the heart, the confession of the mouth, and the reparation—the oral confession of sin, *i.e.*, confession to a priest, is not absolutely necessary to salvation. A man may be saved even without confessing his sins to a priest.[2] With much greater justice may one assert that God sets free the truly penitent from the bonds of condemnation; for the repentant confession of the heart alone suffices the really penitent for the salvation of his soul. The oral confession and the absolution by the priest are not equally necessary.[3] Hus in these passages cites, it is true, the testimony of Peter Lombard and Richard de St. Victore; but there can be no doubt that here, too, he rests upon the shoulders of Wiclif, for the latter also has expressed himself in a very similar manner against the opinion that the oral confession of sin is essential to the valid accomplishment of the sacrament of penitence.

[1] Lenz, *l.c.*, 140.

[2] "Ex his patet, quod potest aliquis homo salvari, qui non confitetur ore sacerdoti mortali." Hus, *Opera*, i. 168 *b*, 169 *a*.

[3] "Recte quidem dicitur quod dominus vere penitentem a vinculo damnacionis absolvit. Sola enim cordis confessio veraciter penitenti ad salutem anime sufficit. Tamen articulus necessitatis oris confessionem et sacerdotis absolucionem excludit." *Opera*, i. 215 *a*.

Wiclif has even advanced several weighty reasons beyond those which Hus has accepted. He speaks of auricular confession as a modern invention, and traces it back to Innocent III.[1] To confess one's sins to a priest is not necessary to the soul's salvation: many under the old and the new covenant have become holy without this. If, however, it was necessary in the time of Innocent III., it must also have been necessary before that time; and so men had sinned by the disregard of this kind of penitence.[2]

In the tractate *De dissensione paparum*, Wiclif speaks about the causes of the pronounced schism, and finds them in the craving of the popes for honours and worldly possessions. In the time of the Apostle Peter, when the Church possessed no "dotation," there was also no strife. If you take away the former, the latter too will be appeased without great difficulty. It is the business of the secular power prudently to remove the nurseries of discord.[3]

[1] "Impossibiles autem errores incidunt antichristi filii de penitencia, cum nesciunt fundare istam penitenciam, quam papa de novo instituit. Evidencia autem que fidem faceret vel scriptura nescit eciam si penitens sit contritus vel peccatum suum deletum aut non, sicut nescit quantitatem vel qualitatem penitencie iniungende."

[2] "Non est de necessitate salutis, quod quilibet beatificandus, eciam dum discrecionem attigerat, confitebatur omnia peccata sua proprio sacerdoti, quia antequam ista lex fuerit edita, multi sancti fuerant salvati tam de lege antiqua, quam de lege gracie . . . Si huius legis ediccio fuit ita racionalis tempore Innocencii III., ista racio stetit prius et sic homines ex omissione talis penitencie antea peccaverunt."

[3] *Cod. un. Prag.*, X. E. 9, fol. 208: "Igitur videtur . . . tamquam probabile, quod ista dissensio propter cupiditatem mundati honoris et temporalium adiacencium est tanta. Nam supposita in papa sicut fuit in Petro dotacione . . . videtur, quod supra bona virtutum et gracie non sonabit . . . sed

In like manner does Hus also investigate the causes of this "diabolical contention," and discovers them similarly in the "dotation" of the Church. Hus has not indeed drawn the consequences of this doctrine in so sharp and trenchant a way as Wiclif, where he is speaking of the schism; on the other hand, he argues in his controversial work against Stanislas, that the majority of errors and schisms have always arisen on account of the Pope. For as long as there was no imperial dotation the Church had constantly increased in virtues; from this time, however, all evils had multiplied. Pride and ambition, avarice and simony, strut and boast, and the schisms and controversies will not cease, until this "head with his body" is brought back to the "rule" of the apostles. In thus speaking Hus makes the same demand as Wiclif,[1] from whom in truth he immediately succeeded to it.

propter ista nunquam fuisset talis contencio. Ideo relinquitur, quod propter honores mundanos et secularia dominia que sunt adiecta papatui ista diabolica contencio est exorta." With Hus it is said (*Opp.*, i. 230 *b*): "Unde autem ista diabolica contencio originaliter a causa movente potest caecus palpare, quia a dotacione."

[1] *Opera*, i. 239: "Constat enim Christi fidelibus, quod maximi errores et maxime scissiones propter illud caput in ecclesia sunt exorte et usque hodie augmentantur. Donec enim illud caput non fuit institutum a cesare, crevit continue in virtutibus ecclesia, sed post constitucionem illius capitis multiplicata sunt mala . . . nec cessabunt, donec illud caput cum suo corpore ad apostolorum regulam sit reductum. Quanti autem sint errores in capitis curia et quanti orti sunt principaliter a tempore, quo papa non in Christi sed in cesaris habitu et damnatione floruit, patet in gestis paparum et chronicis." Comp. also *Opera*, i. 283 *b*, 331 *a*.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

I.

On the Number of the Churches and Villages in Bohemia at the Beginning of the Fifteenth Century.

Nota : Ecclesie Pragensis diocesis tot sunt : mille noningenta (sic) triginta et una preter claustra et capellas.

Sunt ville in regno Bohemie triginta millia sexingenta (sic) sexaginta sex preter oppida civitates et castra.[1]

(Notice belonging to the 15th century in the *Cod. Trebon.*, A. 7, fol. 79 *b.*)

II.

Extracts from the Visitation Book of the Diocese of Prague (of the Year 1379).

[To p. 14.]

Cod. arch. metrop. cap. Prag. XIV.

The visitation was made by Paul of Janowitz.

"Ecclesia sancti Michaelis in Opatowicz :

"Domine reverende : de concubina Mangonis cuiusdam noveritis, quod ipsa manet in plebe sancti Nicolai retro ecclesiam sancti Nicolai . . .

[1] Since Bohemia in the present day counts only 13,286 towns and villages, the above statement is manifestly exaggerated.

"Ipsamet autem concubina nuncupatur Margaretha, que nuper habuit puerum et iterum est pregnata per eundem Mangonem, quia singulis noctibus eam non cessat visitare. Insuper uxor legitima ipsius Andrlini predicti Mangonis moratur in Habr nomine Katharina.

". . . Iesco plebanus dicte ecclesie St. Michaelis dicit, quod circa Hasconem institorem plebis sue sit quidam Martinus scriptor, cuius uxor dicitur fuisse amaria (sic) dicti plebani eiusque hospicium cotidie visitat dictus plebanus ut creditur amore dicte uxoris. Item dicit, quod domum Margarethe, de qua supra . . . visitant impudice multe persone ut dicitur causa turpitudinis.

"Ecclesia in Zderas:" Nicholas Scala deposes that the vicar of St. Martin's holds converse with beguines (cum beginis convivasse).

Vitko deposes: "Quod dominus Gregorius archidiaconus Belinensis habet Kaczkam concubinam in domo sua . . .

"Ecclesia sancti Egidii:" mostly affairs of concubinage.

"Item dicit Henricus, quod in domo dominorum abbatis et conventus monasterii Sedlicensis moretur quidam notarius nomine Hersso, de quo dicitur, quod daret pecunias ad usuras.

"Poric. Ecclesia sancti Clementis; Ecclesia bene ornata, sacramenta sub bona custodia habentur . . ., duo missalia et unum de specialibus missis, tres calices, quorum unus deauratus et duo argentei, quinque ornatus, quorum tres festivales cum plenis apparatibus, altaria tria cooperta bonis pallis . . .

". . . Item dixit: dominus Wenceslaus vicarius ipsius ecclesie sancti Clementis habeat concubinam, que olim fuerit nutrix Rotlebi pie memorie, ex qua duos pueros procreavit, qui testis fuit nuper per quandam mulierem petitus, ut dicte concubine puerum baptizaret, quod facere noluit."

Thus it goes on. Of a monk in the Slavonian cloister it is asserted that he has a house in which he keeps concubines. A clergyman comes every day to Prague to entertain himself, "est nimis secularis" . . . In almost all parishes there are public-houses, in many four and more. The book also gives a good account of the state of matters in the country places.

Visitation of the Deanery Podhradensis (Podbrdsky[1]), of 17-21 November, 1379.

First the parish of Beraun (Verona) is visited (17 Nov.) There matrimonial differences are composed.

"Item dicit quod dominus Ulricus de Usdicz habet quandam Dorotheam domesticam a longo tempore, que dicitur esse concubina ipsius, que sepius solet venire in civitatem et vendere blada et caseos."

Then followed Poczapel, Zebrak (Mendico), Rzebriky, on the 18th November: Tmam, Borek, Tetin, Liten; on the 19th: Wseradicz, Skripel, Neumetely, Lochowicz, Bezdiez (Bezdedice); Horowitz he enters on the 20th Nov. In most places he hears complaints of concubinage. In Horowitz he learns that Nicolaus Stechonis has a lawful wife who lives in Prague. By another woman he has four children or more.

"Item dicunt, quod quidam dictus Georgius vicarius ibidem nunc vicarius in Poczapel hoc anno in Ostensione reliquiarum inventus fuit concubare cuidam maritate ibidem in Horowitz." There he learns also that the vicar of Zbiroh has a concubine and a great son; the chaplain in Mrtniky often wrangles, "et incedit valde curte veste et cum armis, et dicunt quod officia, interdum missam, in lorica (celebrat)." There he learns also that the parish priest in Rebriky has a concubine and some boys; the woman is said to have a legitimate husband. The parish priest in Uzdicz has a concubine, to whom he has assigned a particular room. The priest Gilko is a concubinary and a drunkard, "et dicunt quod ipse quandam filiam sutoris virginem anno preterito abduxerat, cum qua bene triginta septimanas giravit . . ." The vicar Jacob in Gynecz (Jince) remains in the tavern in place of going to church.

"Georgius de Verona presbyter tunc vicarius in Horzowicz nunc vicarius in Poczapel in Ostensione reliquiarum anno de presenti inventus noctis tempore in lecto cum

[1] The decanatus Podhradensis is the fifth of the ten deaneries belonging to the archidiaconate of Prague; see the division upon the mapa cited below. All the places here mentioned will be found there.

Wyska muliere uxore Pawliconis, qui fuit multum male tractatus et recessit . . .

"Petrus de Cralowicz presbyter a decem annis prius vicarius ibidem a festo sancti Georgii anni presentis dicit, quod Marsso (Mares) iudex et Sbinco vicinus suus et quidam Dubcz sunt in excommunicacione maiori propter inieccionem manu violenta in clericum ordinatum.

"Item ibidem dominus archidiaconus Pragensis mandavit Stephano laico de Pribram, ut summa diligencia adhibita Elizabeth uxorem suam legitimam querat undique per terram quam dicit a se recessisse." In case of his refusal he is to be excommunicated.

From Horowic he repairs to Mrtniky, to Gynecz (20th Nov.), to Pyeczina (Picina) on the 21st Nov.: "Item dicunt, quod anno de presenti in messe dominus Ioannes plebanus in Lhota arripuerat quandam ancillam Mathie, quam voluit supponere in campo et ex casu quidam venit ad hoc, in quem irruit gladio evaginato, ut audiunt . . . Item dicunt, quod idem Ioannes plebanus in taberna ibidem in Picina libenter chorizat." Thence the journey is to Lhota Bavari, Sacer campus (Svaté pole) on the 21st November, Knyn (22nd of November), and Lhota dicta in Scharticz (?).

The Visitation of the Deanery of Beneschau, 23rd—26th of November, 1379.[1]

On the 23rd Nov. the archdeacon enters the deanery of Beneschau. In Ziwhoscz the parish priest tells him how the monastery of Konigsaal sought to deprive him of a field and three woods, in the same way in which it had deprived another, who was not able to carry on a controversy . . .

"Hermannus de Chotiesko plebezanus dicte plebis dicit, quod plebanus in Knyn libenter intrat tabernas et iocatur et interdum suffunditur sed non multum . . ."

On the same day he learns in Byelicz: "Quod plebanus in Slaps dictus Czisko cotidie habet concubinas plures,

[1] The places here mentioned are almost all likewise to be found in the *Historicka mapa Czech, Abh. der böhm. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*. Sixth Series. Vol. viii.

quarum una dicitur Sbisca de Neweklow. Propter quam litigavit cum . . . plebano in Marssowicz, qui eandem sibi abduxerat, propter quod diu inimicicias habuerunt, sed dictus Czisko virginitate privavit dictam Sbiscam.

"Item quod plebanus in Marssowicz tenet concubinam in domo sua uxorem censualem sui viciniaris curie . . . ex qua genuit filium quatuor annorum et filiam trium annorum. Tunc dicit, quod sepius visitavit in Neveklow, ubi ante unum annum adulterabatur cum uxore Kirzankonis sed modo prohibitus per dominos loci dictum oppidum visitare . . .

"Item dicit, quod plebanus in Chwoinecz habet concubinam a multis annis, ex qua unum filium magnum genuit, qui est scolaris et Ripa vocatur . . ."

On the same day he comes to Ujezd, where Johannes de Wrzicz has been priest for the last four years: "Dominus archidiaconus mandat ei, ut doceat de commissione cure animarum et formatis infra unum mensem sub pena excommunicacionis."

There he learns that the vicar, David, has been living for three years past in Netwerzicz with the daughter of one of his tenants. On the same day the archdeacon reaches this place, where what he has heard is confirmed to him. The archdeacon enjoins upon the parish priest not to suffer this woman any more to enter his house in order to come to the vicar; the former, himself, was to guard against drunkenness, "et a conversacione vagarum mulierum." This David complains on his part of one of his neighbours; and so the visitator comes on the same day to Chwoinecz (Chwojenec), where he listens to complaints about usury. The accused (see above) deposes that Ripa is his sister's son. On the same day the church in Neworzicz is visited, and investigation is made. In Marsowic, which he reaches on the following day (24th of November), he finds that the parish priest possesses a copy of the Statutes, it is true, but the paper is greatly damaged; on which account it is enjoined upon him to obtain the same, as also the Synodal Statutes, upon parchment. Thence the course is to Janowicz, Martinicz, and Ugesdez, where the condition of affairs is very similar. The plebanus at the last-named place has to pledge himself never again to keep a concubine. A legal

document of 5th January, 1380, declares: "Anno domini 1380, die quinto Ianuarii dominus Petrus predictus veniens ad domum habitacionis nostre promisit nobis archidiacono et mihi Vito notario publico, quod amplius nunquam habebit Boukam aut aliam quamcunque in dote vel extra pro concubina. Dictam Boukam domum suum intrare non permittat nec loquatur nec convivet nec comedet cum eadem sub pena quinque sexagenarum pro fabrica."

As one sees, if a formal charge was brought, the accused was cited, and threatened with a certain penalty.

On the 25th November Paul of Janowitz comes to Olbramowitz. There, and in the places following, there are differences on account of adultery to be settled, which proceed from laymen; then also contentions on account of clerical persons, charges like the above. From Olbramowitz he goes to Tozicz (Tozice), Bistricz, Oldrichow, Tynecz, Chrast, Kostelecz, Lidecz, and Poric.

The charges throughout the whole deanery, as will be seen, affect almost exclusively the unchastity of the clergy. Only in Netwerzicz is accusation further made against a certain Marsico, "Qui homicida reputatur, qui Wetkam filiam coloni sui defloravit."

In October began the visitation of the archidiaconate of Prague, and in the first place that of Prague itself: "Anno domini 1379 die octavo mensis Octobris ego Paulus de Janowicz, archidiaconus Pragensis cepi visitare dictum archidiaconatum et primo civitatem Pragensem." The charges of unchastity and adultery occur likewise in Prague; but, as it would seem, with comparatively less frequency than in the country.

At the visitation the priests engaged in Church work are enumerated and characterised in detail. Inquiries are made as to age, incomes, as to neighbouring clergy, the state of the faithful, etc. As a sample we may take the visitation of the church of St. Mary before the Freudenhof:—

". . . Item dicit, quod dominus plebanus sancti Martini in muro habeat concubinam, quam vidit anno preterito.

"Item dicunt, quod plebanus sepissime non patitur sepeliri pauperes homines, nisi plus faciat pactum cum eisdem, et non vult sibi sufficere in offertorio, quod pauperes homines

vellent facere, sed adhuc semper compellit eos ad dandum sibi pecuniam, de quo causantur ut plurimum.

"Item dicit Conradus, ut audivit de concubina, que visitat ipsum plebanum.

"Item dicunt, quod Procopius dictus Wassermann parochianus ibidem mutuat pecuniam super censum nomine usurarum et mutuat centum sex pro quinquaginta annuatim, de quo est publica vox et fama in civitate Pragensi.

"Obligacio: Anno domini 1380 die vicesima septima mensis Marcii in Wissegrado prope Pragam in domo habitacionis honorabilium virorum dominorum Rynini Pilznensis et Pauli Pragensis archidiaconi constitutus personaliter dominus Bartholomeus, plebanus ecclesie sancte Marie, ante Letam curiam maioris civitatis Pragensis coram dicto domino domino archidiacono Pragensi promisit ad manus ipsius domini archidiaconi et mei notarii, quod ipse Manduss(y)am uxorem Iohannis fistulatoris ad dotem suam deinceps non admittet, nec ubi eadem Mandussya morabitur, ipsam visitabit nec cum eadem amplius bibet nec comedet nec aliam conversacionem habebit cum eadem et non permittet ipsam tenere clavem de porta domus dotis sue, cum qua dicta domus aperiretur, sub pena decem grossorum pro fabrica ecclesie Pragensi solvendorum, cui se sponte submisit presentibus dominis, etc. . . .

". . . Item dicunt, quod ad domus dominorum canonicorum quasi communiter solent intrare mulieres publice, de quo multi homines scandalizentur.

"Dominus Iohannes prepositus monialium sancte Marie Magdalene dicit, quod interdum pauperes homines parrochiani dicte ecclesie conqueruntur de preposito, quod interdum tardantur per presbyterum in confessione pro eo, quia est antiquus et infirmus."

III.

On Konrad of Waldhausen.

[To p. 20, *sqq.*]

Since those two letters of Konrad of Waldhausen which were to have been furnished here—that to the Master of

the Order of the Dominicans (of 3rd January, 1360),[1] and that to the Superior of the Augustin convent of St. Thomas in Prague (of 13th February, 1364)[2]—have meanwhile been given in print by Ferdinand Mencik in his essay, "Konrad Waldhauser, mnich radu svateho Augustina," in vol. xi. of the *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Sciences* (1—33), Prague, 1882, it may suffice in this place to refer to the copy there published. Mencik furnishes in this essay fourteen other letters and documents which proceed from the pen of Konrad, or have reference to him. These are a letter of Konrad to Bishop Gottfried de Weisseneck of Passau (of the year 1362);[3] one to the inhabitants of Austria (of the year 1364); to Charles IV. (circa 1365), then the answer of the latter; a letter of safe conduct from the Archbishop of Prague for Konrad of Waldhausen (of the year 1364); a letter of the citizens of Saaz for Konrad of Waldhausen (of 5th May, 1365); two letters of Adalbertus Ranconis (of 7th June and 13th December, 1365); a letter of Urban V. (of 22nd February, 1366); a charter of the Duke Albert of Bavaria (of 23rd October, 1365); two papers which concern the relations of Konrad with the Carmelites (of the years 1366 and 1369), and the letter of the Minorite Weiglinus to Konrad (of 17th October, 1366).

The importance we attach to several of these documents may justify our subjecting a few passages therefrom to somewhat closer examination.

---

[1] See Mencik, *Konrad Waldhauser*, 14.

[2] *Ibid.*, 17. "Feria quarta post dominicam qua vocatur Invocavit" is certainly the Wednesday (thus 13th, not 14th February).

[3] Inasmuch as this letter is of considerable interest by way of shedding light upon Konrad's disposition, we may be permitted here to indicate the contents: "Exemplum seu copia epistole, quam misit Chunradus plebanus ad sanctum Thomam et professus in Walthuss anno domini 1362 domino Goffrido, episcopo Pataviensi, incendens ipsum inducere per ipsam, ut multis erroribus in diocesi contingentibus et permaxime abolende pravitati symoniace plurimum in ordinibus clericorum exercite obviaret ipsosque prohiberet. Dabantur enim tunc temporis circa quadraginta denariorum solummodo pro intitulacione subdiacono et septuaginta pro formata. Et hec ultra plurimum multiplicabant." Mencik, *l.c.*, No. 2.

Exceedingly significant for Konrad's relations towards the Mendicant Friars is the above-mentioned letter of the burghers of Saaz (Mencik, 22, 23). These relate that, at the moment when Konrad began a sermon in the parish church at Saaz on the 1st May, 1365, the Minorites of this town began to toll the great bell in their church, in order to stop Konrad's preaching. The same thing they did also on the following day. But Konrad led his audience out of the church, and preached to them in the principal square of the town. Thereupon the Minorites marched with their relics past the square, and began to sing with a loud voice, although it was not the festival of relics. On the following Sunday—it was the 4th May—Konrad's pulpit was found lying in the gutter.[1] When Konrad afterwards preached his farewell sermon, these monks cried out with a loud voice: "What this Sir Konrad has here preached and said is, except the epistles and gospels, all lies." Konrad obtained from the magistrates of the town a testimony duly drawn up to these doings of the monks.

In this conflict with the mendicant friars Adalbertus Ranconis also takes the part of Konrad, whom in a letter he calls his best friend. He finds fault with those who call this man, the zealous herald of the truth, a heretic: "Dogmatizare enim ut audio divinas adulterantes scripturas presumunt, quod licet presentibus carnalibus filias proprias a nupciis legalibus retrahere et ipsas sub tempore inicio pecunie monasteriis mancipare." . . . Yet more clearly does one discern the above-cited (p. 32) charges of the mendicant friars from the following propositions: "Asserunt eciam dicti apostatici spiritus omnem rerum usum esse illicitum, quod eorum secta esse licitum non prescribit. Patribus eciam suis spiritualibus, qui ipsos per evangelium genuerunt et in racione super ipsos trinitatis sanctissime nomine Christianos fecerunt, non parcunt, dum nonnun-

[1] "De mane diei dominice, qua cantatur Iubilate, sedes, in qua predicabat, inventa fuit in fonte seu aqua, que per canalia currit in civitate, quod creditur eorundem fratrum disposicione esse factum. Sed hodie cum valedicens populo ultimum sermonem faceret antedicti fratres clamaverunt alta voce: 'Quidcunque idem dominus Konrad vobis predicavit et dixit, totum exceptis epistolis et evangeliis mentitum est et non verum.'"

quam in tocius cleri grave et intolerabile scandalum prelatos et curatos ecclesiarum publice in suis sermonibus idiotas, concubinarios, simoniacos, et neglectores non rectores ecclesiarum appellant, audentque cum illo reprobo Cham patris sui detegere pudenda."

Of Konrad himself Ranconis boasts: "Vos unus de mille zelo fidei et veritatis accensus caritate stimulante et fraterna utilitate provocante contra veritatis impugnatores et superstitionis inventores singulare certamen subistis et in isto certamine Goliam, qui exprobavit agminibus Dei viventis, quod est statibus clericorum, in funda et lapide deiecistis et mendaces ostendistis eos, qui vos Christi domini veritatis cultorem, morum satorem, religionis regulam, continentie exemplum, virtutum speculum, preconem evangelii, se de pestis labe hinc inde litteras falsas mittendo respergere et de heresi mendacissime accusare presumpserunt." Ranconis hopes Konrad will, as a second Elias, complete what he has gloriously begun, that his word will as a burning torch melt hearts of stone and make them receptive for the Word of God. Then will those sins disappear from which the city of Prague is suffering.[1] With a significant turn,—that he is indeed a very sincere friend, but a secret one, for fear of the Jews and Pharisees,—this most interesting of all the letters which have come down to us from Adalbertus Ranconis is brought to a close. The important position held by Konrad of Waldhausen is manifest from every line thereof.

[1] "Iam ut audio in dicta civitate Pragensi civium utriusque sexus superbie ventus detronuit, avaricie estus refriguit, continencia viget in clericis, devocio fervescit in laicis, iam Deo auspice mulierum facies non stibio pinguntur, non luxu vestium inceditur, non ornamentis peplorum vacatur, pudicicia olim proscripta de postlimio revertitur, frontes matronarum inpudice non tenduntur insursus, cervix equo libramine suis respondet humeris, cessant in ecclesiis aucupia mulierum, impudicicie signa arrisu non prebentur feminis, clerus honoratur, religio vera colitur, ypocrisis et ficta religio arguitur et ut uno verbo multa includam, virtutum in civitate Pragensi prefocate segetes . . . vestro patrocinio hiis diebus revirescunt."

IV.

On Mathias of Janow.

[p. 45.]

De recepcione in canonicum magistri Mathie de Janow.

(E. reg. recepcionum in canonicos eccl. Prag. Cod. arch. XIII., fol. 78 *b*.)

1.

"Item anno 1381 indiccione quarta die duodecima mensis Octobris hora terciarum in capitulo ecclesie Pragensi vir Magister Mathias Wenczeslai de Janow personaliter constitutus coram honorabilibus viris dominis Przibicone decano, Paulo archidiacono, magistro Adalberto scolastico, Przibislao Horssowiensi, magistro Mathia Lythomericensi, Iohanne Gradicensi, magistro Fridmanno Belinensi archidiaconis, Benessio de Wyethmel, Haskone decano sancti Apollinaris, Benessio de Chobolicz, Martino de Olomucz canonicis ecclesie Pragensis literas gracie sue infrascripte videlicet graciosam et executoriam sub veris bullis domini Urbani pape sexti et processum inde habitum exhibuit et dictis dominis tunc capitulariter congregatis et capitulum facientibus easdem insinuavit et presentavit. Qui domini eisdem literis visis et lectis deliberacione inter eos prehabita prefato magistro Mathie capitulariter responderunt, quod ipsi volunt et parati sunt mandatis apostolicis huiusmodi obedire et ipsum magistrum Mathiam receperunt in canonicum et in fratrem. Qui magister Mathias tactis corporaliter sacrosanctis ewangeliis iuramentum consuetum de observandis statutis et consuetudinibus dicte ecclesie in manibus dicti domini Przibiconis decani prestitit, cuius iuramenti forma circa librum sacramentorum dignoscitur esse descripta. Deinde prelibatus dominus Przibico decanus stallum in choro et locum in capitulo ipsius ecclesie cum plenitudine iuris canonici in sinistra parte chori assignavit, de quibus omnibus et singulis prefatus magister Mathias peciit sibi fieri per me notarium publicum infrascriptum legitime plura

publicum seu publica instrumenta. Per me Simonem notarium capituli presentibus honorabilibus et discretis viris Smilone sacrista, Iohanne domini Martini de Olomucz, Conrado domini Wenceslai canonicorum vicariis, in ecclesia Pragensi antedicta testibus ad premissa vocatis specialiter et rogatis.

2.

"Tenor graciose[1] magistri Mathie de Janow, de qua superius fit mencio, sequitur et est talis :

"Urbanus episcopus servus servorum Dei dilecto filio Mathie Wenceslai de Janow, canonico Pragensi, magistro in artibus salutem et apostolicam benediccionem. Literarum sciencia vite ac morum honestas aliaque laudabilia probitatis et virtutum merita, super quibus apud nos fide digno commendaris testimonio, nos inducunt, ut tibi reddamur ad graciam liberales. Volentes itaque tibi, qui presbyter es et ut asseris per sex annos studuisse in theologia Parisius premissorum meritorum tuorum intuitu graciam facere specialem canonicatum ecclesie Pragensis cum plenitudine iuris canonici apostolica tibi auctoritate conferimus et de illo eciam providemus prebendam iure, si qua in dicta ecclesia vacat ad presens vel cum vacaverit . . .

"Datum Rome apud sanctum Petrum Kalendis Aprilis pontificatis nostri anno tercio.

3.

"Urbanus episcopus servus servorum Dei venerabili fratri episcopo (!) Pragensi et dilectis filiis abbati monasterii Brewnowiensis prope Pragam ac decano ecclesie sancti Egidii Pragensis salutem et apostolicam benediccionem. Literarum sciencia vite ac morum honestas aliaque laudabilia probitatis et virtutum merita, super quibus apud nos dilectus filius Mathias Wenczeslai de Janow, canonicus Pragensis, magister in artibus, fide digno commendatur testimonio, nos inducunt, ut sibi reddamur ad graciam liberales. Volentes itaque eidem Mathie, qui presbyter est et ut asseritur per sex annos in theologia Parisius

[1] Gracie.

studuit, premissorum meritorum suorum intuitu graciam facere specialem canonicatum ecclesie Pragensis cum plenitudine iuris canonici apostolica eidem Mathie auctoritate contulimus . . .

"Datum Rome apud sanctum Petrum Kal. Aprilis pontificatus nostri anno tercio."

V.

Notice Concerning the Burning of Wiclif's Books.

[p. 116.]

(*E cod. III. G.* 16. *saec. XV. bibl. univ. Prag.*, fol. 98.)

"Anno domini 1410 proxima feria quarta post festum sancte Margarethe virginis[1] hora terciarum vel quasi in curia archiepiscopi Pragensis astante domino Sbyncone, episcopo ecclesie Pragensis, una cum pluribus fide dignis combusti sunt quam plures libri Iohannis Wikleff et per doctores quosdam reprobati. Sed universitas Pragensis tali combustioni librorum non consensit, ut patet in uno statuto eorum in parva materia, unde et laici de Sbyncone cantabant:

Sbyniek (biskup) abcda
Spalil knieha a newieda
Czo ge w nich napsano.[2]

"Item ut fatur, nescius tamen si sit sic, anno domini 1413 combusti sunt libri Iohannis Wikleff in Roma ante gradus ecclesie s. Petri in die Scolastice virginis (Feb. 10). Non est mirum, quia bene descripsit antichristum cum sua synagoga et fratribus cappatis ipsum protegentibus."

---

[1] July 16. [2] See above, pp. 89, 117.

VI.

THE DEFENCE OF WICLIF'S TRACTATES, BY JOHN HUS, JACOB OF MIES, SIMON OF TISSNOW, PROKOP OF PILSEN, ZDISLAS OF ZWIERTETITZ, AND JOHN OF GICZIN, DURING THE TIME FROM 26TH OF JULY TO 6TH OF AUGUST, 1410.

[p. 121 sqq.]

Of these apologetic addresses only one has hitherto been published in a complete form—that delivered by Hus.[1] But much more trenchant, as also more provoking, were the addresses of some of Hus' companions. The address in particular of Simon of Tissnow produced a powerful impression. This is best perceived from the fact that the opposite party felt aggrieved by the tone which pervades the whole discourse. It is the only one of which mention was made in after time. Yet the address, too, of Prokop of Pilsen, as that of Zdislas, claims considerable interest. So much cannot be asserted for the others, least of all for that of Jacobell, who defended Wiclif's *Decalogus*. We, therefore, present in the full text only the tractates of Simon of Tissnow and Prokop of Pilsen, according to a MS. of the Imperial Library at Vienna, with some emendations of the text in accordance with the reading of a Prague MS. With regard to the rest, it may suffice that some few passages to which a greater interest attaches, be selected.

1.

Jacob of Mies defends the Decalogue of John Wiclif.

[1410, July 28.]

Incipit defensio libri decalogi magistri Iohannis de Vicleph contexta per reverendum magistrum Iacobum de Miza, sacre theologie baccalaureum.

(*Cod. univ. Prag.* X. E. 24, fol. 129.)[2]

"Cum sentencia libri decalogi magistri Iohannis Wykleph, in qua continetur veritas vite et doctrine ewan-

[1] *Opera*, i. 105 *a*.

[2] The Vienna MS. 4002 does not contain this address

gelice, sit condempnata velut heretica, quam veritatem Dei mandatorum quilibet fidelis christicola tenetur defendere usque ad mortem, ideo certamen est nobis subire et colluctuacio est nobis non adversus carnem et sanguinem gladio materiali sed adversus principatus et potestates et rectores tenebrarum harum in ecclesiam introductos"[1] . . .

2.

Simon of Tissnow defends Wiclif's tractate De probacionibus proposicionum (1410, July 29.)

Protestacio magistri Symonis de Tysnow.

(*Cod. pal. Vind.* 4002, fol. 31—41.)

"In primis protestor, quod nec iam nec in posterum intendo aliquid pertinaciter dicere vel defendere contra Dei legem et fidem Iesu Christi sed solum (ad) Dei honorem et edificacionem ecclesie. Et si aliquid erravero, peto veniam et submitto me correccioni et informacioni cuiuscumque fidelis, ne fidelibus sequela Iesu Christi et suorum apostolorum tamquam heresis abiciatur et conversio omnino ad seculum tamquam fides approbetur et cetera.[2]

"Audistis heri et pridie magistros et dominos meos reverendos librorum scripture sacre defensores, qui habitu theologico induti sua verba scripture sacre devotissime coaptarunt. Ego vero me posui pro defensione logice puerorum, ideo mea disponam verba pro audiencia puerorum et quia mea sonavit (?) intimacio, quod scilicet[3] velim premissa fideli protestacione tractatum de probacionibus proposicionum defendere magistri Iohannis Wiklef contra condempnatores eiusdem tractatus et quod velim sustinere, quod nulla heresis nec alius manifestus error fidei catholice contrarius in eodem assertive continetur, ideo

[1] Of the Decalogus hardly anything is spoken. Neither are the relations of persons and things touched upon. The whole nature of the conflict comes out with much greater animation in the two following tractates.

[2] This paragraph is wanting in the Vienna MS. 4002. Supplemented after *Cod. un. Prag.*, X. E. 24, fol. 133*a*.

[3] Wanting in the *Cod. Pal.* 4002.

publice protestor, quod non intendo in hoc actu nec in alio per me in futurum fiendo aliquam heresim defendere vel astruere nec aliquem errorem fidei catholice repugnantem. Si autem hoc fecero, nunc et semper habeo pro non dicto.

"Nunc igitur in presenti actu vestras intendo pias mentes ad compaciendum de hoc commisso malo scelere excitare et deinde, quantum in me fuerit, vos volo inducere ad decertandum pro fidei veritate. Ad laudem igitur et gloriam Dei omnipotentis eiusque virginis matris Marie tocius eciam milicie celestis nec non tocius militantis ecclesie profectum pro conservacione suarum[1] veritatum accessurus ad presentis operis faccionem necessarium habeo premittere, quamvis in composito sermone quedam (sunt), que concernunt oportunitatem facti huius: diu enim *posui*[2] *custodiam ori meo, obmutui, humiliatus sum et silui*[3] *a bonis et dolor meus renovatus* est in tantum, quod dignum est flere, indignumve tacere.

"Iam autem sic dolore tactus cordis restat seram frangere labiorum, ut prorumpam in verbula que concepi. *Loquar igitur in amaritudine anime mee, audite queso celi que loquar, audiat terra verba oris mei et populus gencium convertat huc aures suas.* Ut tamen sim fultus autentico testimonii dicto, assumo illud 1° Elencorum philosophi dictum loco thematis verbum: *Duo sunt opera sapientis, mencientem scire manifestare, non mentiri, que de quibus novit.*

"Ecce reverendi patres magistri et domini ceterique fratres in Christo predilecti: Non sine dolore cordis mei sed et in habundancia refero lacrimarum: Illa prefulgida gentis nostre fama Boemorum nominibus supervolans, quam quondam celebris vulgata clamavit opinio hec puta: *Gens Bohemica est universaliter mundissima ab heretica feditate,* illam inquam sine nostris[4] demeritis nonnulli temerarie cum grandi famosaque infamia denigrarunt, quia ab Errorio[5] iuste obedienciam abtraximus, cetui[6] cardinalium ad-

[1] Likewise wanting in the same.
[2] Also wanting there.
[3] Psalm xxxix. 2.
[4] In *Cod. Vind.:* matris.
[5] Nickname of Gregory XII.
[6] Not "ceteri;" Höfler, ii. 207, where there are also other incorrect readings.

herentes una cum serenissimo principe et domino Wenceslao Romanorum rege semper Augusto et Boemie rege. Sumus scismatici appellati, ubi tamen splendor luce solis clarior satis patule declaravit, quod illi, qui dicti Errorii partem foventes sub pena ignis ad certamen se obligare nitebantur, quoad hoc una cum reverendo domino Sbinkone Pragensis ecclesie archiepiscopo dampnabiliter erraverunt. Sed quid fuerit deinde dilectissimi subsecutum pro vestris rogo clemenciis, me modicum sustinete. Ecce in vindictam suam, ut eo liberius possent conceptam de nobis maliciam deducere in effectum, nonnullos fidelium partis nostre tanquam de heresi suspectos officialibus denunciare procurarunt, deinde ipsos in articulis examinarunt, alios incarcerarunt aliosque contra totum iuris ordinem ad abiurandum ex concepta malicia compulerunt et omni adhibita crudelitate nec unum errorem infectum poterant invenire, ut ipsorum protestatur proclamacio synodalis. Adhuc queso amantissimi mihi paululum vestro favete silencio et vigili percipite mente. Hiis non contenti sed ad extinguendum odorem suavissime fame nostre per certos suos nuncios veritatis et iusticie inimicos bullas cum coronatis a sede apostolica mendaciis procurarunt, que in nostram infamiam sonaverunt quamvis false, quod multorum corda in regno Bohemie et marchionatu Moravie sunt ex falso dogmate librorum magistri Iohannis Wyclef pravitate heretica sauciata. Virtute cuius quidem bulle sic mendaciose et surrepticie acquisite in condempnacionem librorum et combustionem iniustissime processerunt, inter quos hic innocens et iustus tractatulus *De probacionibus proposicionum* tanquam hereticus est condempnatus.

"O mi tractatule innocens et iuste, quid queso adversi hiis tuis condempnatoribus et prelatis ceteris intulisti? An forte ambicionem superbam in prelatis corripuisti? Respondet tractatulus: *Non mei hoc officii, sed hoc pertinet ad librum De civili dominio, qui eciam mecum est condempnatus.* An forte insaciabilem voraginosamque sacerdotum avariciam correxisti? Respondet tractatulus: *Non ego sed Sermones super ewangelia per circulum anni hoc fecerunt mecum condempnati.* Sed forte mi tractatule dampnabilem simoniacam heresim dictis scripturis es persecutus? *Non feci ego, sed De simonia tractatus mecum condempnatus hoc pertractat.*

Rogo mi tractatule, si forte ewangelicam commendasti prelatis displicibilem paupertatem? *Non in me hec continentur*, respondet tractatulus, *sed in Dialogo et Trialogo mecum eciam condempnatis.* Timeo ergo iam mi tractatule, quod forte ignoranciam cleri, torporem et ocium condempnasti. Respondet tractatulus: *Mi defensor in questionibus hiis queso ne fatigeris. Ego ipse meum crimen profiteor, si crimen censebitur aput sapientes. Nichil horum que de me suspicaris ego tango; invenibus enim innocentibus ego datus sum michi amantissimis, in quorum faciebus rosa cum lilio pulcritudinem attestantur, ut per me discant probare proposiciones, prout meum prohemium protestatur cum incipit: Iuvenum rogatibus quibus afficior superatus ipsorum dulcoravi ingenia astruens et docens, qualiter universalis tam affirmativa quam negativa particularis qualitatis utriusque probari debeant per regulas logicales. Nullum genus proposicionis kathegorice obmisi, quin ipsius difficultates et subtilitates tetigissem, nec mee regule scripture divine quovismodo adversantur, dum sibi subserviant omniquaque. Sed indubie in hunc locum dampnaciones et combustionis innocens missus sum minus iuste.* Ecce iuvenes venustissimi vobis innocentibus hic innocens et iustus tractatulus est condempnatus et combustus, panis vestre floride iuventutis quo nutriebamini per veritatis et vestros inimicos est consumptus. Veritas illa turbata est, que animos vestros dedicaverat sapidissimum vobis saporans saporem, et hoc non rigida parcitate, ymo copia supereffluenti vestris mentibus convivia propinavit. Ob quod prestantissimi iuvenes vestros exercete animos cum murmure ullulanti, dolete dolenterque condolete mei cari iuvenculi: Nam mella labiis vestris delicatissima sunt sublata, que quondam gratissimo suscipiebatis affectu, ex quibus eciam discretissime argumentorum funiculos nectebatis. Sed queso iuvenes speciosi paulisper prestolemini, si forte hii condempnatores vestri tractatuli innocentis faciant ut amici, pro vestro componant ingenio tractatulum meliorem, quod non credo. Rogo saltem m(e)i iuvenes, ut si vestris forte tumultuosis clamoribus respondeant, altis ad ipsos clamate vocibus, ut vobis causas in scripto exhibeant, quare vestrum tractatulum innocentem condempnassent. Si autem nec clamoribus nec humilibus respondeant vestris precibus, pro ipsis orate tanquam pro inimicis. Vobis autem loquor provecciorbus,

qui alcius iuvenibus sapitis racione: Tedeat animam vestram vite vestre, quod umquam ad hunc diem combustionis vestra vos tempora deduxerunt diem utique calamitatis et miserie. Universi attollite animos ad maledicendum diei illi dicentes: *Dies illa vertatur in tenebras, non requirat diem illum deus desuper, nec sit in recordacione nec lumine illustretur. Obscurent eum tenebre et umbra mortis, occupet eum caligo et amaritudine involvatur. Non computetur in diebus anni nec in mensibus numeretur, quia in die illa cecidit corona capitis nostri. Aurea nostra fama est in infamiam immutata, immo quod nimis consternata pronuncio mente, lex Dei vetus et nova saltem in scripto tamquam heresis est combusta.* Quis hec amplius posset sustinere nisi is, qui a fide Iesu (Christi) relegatus est, desponsatus pessimo Antichristo? En rogo, mentes erigite vestras in die illa flebili et amara, fide eradicata non fides in locum fidei est plantata, quantum in ipsis erat. Quis utens racione aliter poterit profiteri, quando[1] nostro innocenti tractatulo in heresim condempnato et combusto oppositum[2] ipsius in fidem infidelium est plantatum?

"Cui tam inique dampnacioni nisi doctus non consenciam in eternum, tum quia contraria fidei christiane, tum quia in meo scripture sacre baccalariatu resistere infidelitati me voluntarie obligavi. Sed ut stilum in condempnatores tamquam huius sceleris ductores convertam et tamquam inimicos veritatis, queso simul in unum miremini dives et pauper tantam correctorum vesanam cernentes audaciam. Nam quas subtiles subtilitates mens sana, mens persuasa non auderet falsas opinari, hii nimis stolide in brevi temporis spacio ipsas in ignis voraginem condempnarunt. O mens talium correctorum delusa, inter sapientes sola insipida, cum tot et tantarum sentenciarum tremenda penetralia tam cito perpetua baptizasti infamia. Nam non ambigo, quin si ex amore facere voluisses, vere et necessario plures noctuum dierumque tetendisses vigilias, sed festinasti, quia malo operi preceps accio est communiter desponsata. Nec insuper dubito, quin favore dominorum et non Christi amore sic in tuo scelesto opere processisti.

---

[1] *Cod. Pal.*: "quin."
[2] *Ibid.*: "opposito."

O mens si mereris dici mens, inter mentes tu sola demens, annon prospicis, quod ex tuo opere maledicto tanta inter regnicolas generasti disturbia, que sancte et fraterne unioni sunt vehementer inimica? Annon omnium circiter adiacencium provinciarum contra nos fauces rabidissimas exacerbasti et quod dudum perversissima gens nobis inimica nostris querebat ascribere cervicibus, sed adhoc quidem per se ipsam impotens per te iam sua desideria adimplevit? Vide quid feceris per excecantem te maliciam: paucos tibi adversarios confundere volens totum regnum confudisti. O mens amara, quare contra tuum tam fidele regnum dentem acuisti mordacem, ut sic feroci morsu morderes rabide innocentes? Morsu enim momordisti amarissimo, morsu venenato non solum senes venerabili canicie coronatos sed eciam viros omni virentes gloria et virtute; eciam iuvenes, qui non aliud quam semper gaudia florida mente querunt, immo et iacentes in cunis parvulos innocentes, quorum natura et arbitrium sunt captivata, non solum parentes sed ad multa tempora nascituros.

"Quid autem dicam de domino reverendissimo domino Sbincone Pragensis ecclesie archiepiscopo, qui talium condempnancium consilia sequebatur. Forte ignorancia excusat eum. Parcatur ergo ei et oretur pro eo. O superamantissimi vos singuli et universi! tanguntne vos supradicta? Vos ipsi iudicate, si fortes in vobis excitant animos compassionis. Multo magis dolere debetis de inuria Deo et sue ecclesie irrogata, pro qua qui certissime legittime certaverit, sine fine premiabitur gloria et honore. Ex hiis flebilibus anxiis et tantis malis inpetu inpellor animi ad standum presto pro defensione cause Dei, fidei catholice, honoris patrie et contra condempnatores huius tractatuli innocentis. Confisus autem de adiutorio altissimi, cuius agitur causa, aggressurus hanc pugnam pro defensione veritatis non sum immemor misericordie et potencie Dei nostri. Si enim pro filiis Israhel adorantibus Deum patrum suorum contra regem Egypti Deus celi apperuit mare, ita ut hinc inde aque quasi muri solidarentur, et isti pede sicco fundum maris perambulando transierunt, in quo loco, dum innumerabilis exercitus Egypciorum ipsos sequeretur, ita aquis coopertus est, ut non remaneret unus, qui factum posteris nunciaret, et filii Israhel ubicunque ingressi sunt

sine arcu et sagitta et absque scuto et gladio, Deus eorum pro eis pugnavit et vicit, et non fuit, qui insultaret populo isti, nisi quando recessit a culturo domini Dei sui. Quociescunque autem preter ipsum Deum suum alterum coluerunt, dati sunt in predam et in gladium et in obprobrium, quociescunque autem penituerunt se recessise a cultura Dei sui, dedit eis Deus celi virtutem resistendi. Ideo coram altissimo pro auxilio humiliter deprecans in persona mea pro nobis omnibus, ut pro nobis ipse pugnet, effundam cum fideli Iudith animam (meam) et dicam : *Domine deus rex celi et terre exaudi me miserum deprecantem et de tua misericordia presumentem, memento domine testamenti tui et da verbum in ore* (*meo*) *et in corde meo consilium corrobora, ut fides eeclesie* (*tue*) *in tua sanctificacione permaneat et omnes gentes agnoscant, quoniam tu es deus et alius non est preter te. Vide domine, quoniam adversarii nostri confidunt in multitudine sua et in curribus suis et in scutis et in sagittis pecuniarum suarum gloriantur et nesciunt, quia tu ipse es Deus noster, qui conteris bella ab inicio et dominus est nomen tibi. Erige brachium tuum sicut ab inicio et allide virtutem ipsorum in virtute tua; cadat virtus eorum in iracundia* (*tua*), *qui promittunt se violare sancta tua et ipsa violarunt et polluerunt tabernaculum nominis tui. Domine deus noster.*

"Scio autem, quia apud dominum humilium deprecacio exauditur, nam non obliviscitur misereri deus nec continet in ira sua misericordias suas. Confisus igitur de domini Dei mei clementi bonitate, qui nunquam despexit sperantes in se, nec unquam derelicti sunt ab eo resumptis spiritibus audacie, fortiter illis condempnatoribus resistam, qui non verebantur confundere veritatem firme sciens, quod quamvis forte sit vinum, forcior rex, forciores illo mulieres; super omnia tamen veritas vincit.[1]

"Sto igitur nunc paratus et opto, vos omnes condempnatores tractatuli mei innocentis ad singulare excitans certamen evoco, invitans vos omnes inclamo novisque clamoribus nisi veneritis inclamare intendo, ut coram multis publice argumentorum ostendat declaracio, si vestra verax exstiterit condempnacio. Et quod clandestino in angulis cudebatis, murmure patulo iam clarescat in lumine,

[1] *Lib. apocr. Esdrae*, lib. 3, cap. 3, 10-12.

si quod venire neglexeritis, notabilia vestre dampnacionis perverse signacula facietis, quod non amore iusticie sed arte callida benedictas licenciastis veritates. Mementote queso illius dicti ewangelici : *Omnis male agens fugit lucem, ut non arguantur eius opera mala.* Sed forte in animo cogitastis : nobis assistit tremenda magna prelatorum potestas nobisque inest nomen magnum et doctoralis honestas, illam omnis homo verebitur, et non est qui resistat nobis. Magis in animo pensare debuistis, quia dominus pro sua pugnans veritate est dominus fortis et potens, dominus potens in prelio, qui non subtrahit personam cuiusquam nec magnitudinem cuiusquam reveretur. Adhuc igitur revertimini ad cor de peractis sceleribus, agite penitenciam, humiliate domino animas vestras, quia multum misericors et prestabilis est super maliciis hominum. Cui sit laus et gloria in secula seculorum Amen. Dicant Amen."

On this lecture the *Chron. Un. Prag.* reports : " Magister Simon de Tissnow S. theologie baccalaureus proxima feria ventura hora undecima premittendo protestacionem fidelem vult defendere tractatum de probacionibus proposicionum magistri Iohannis Wiclef contra condempnatores eiusdem tractatus et sustinebit : quod nulla heresis nec aliquis manifestus error in eodem continetur." According to the Chronicon aforesaid, the lecture took place on the 29th July, 1410.

This tractate is likewise mentioned in the " Invectiva anonymi contra Husitas" (*Geschichtschreiber der hus. Bew.*, i. 621) : " Primo dum condempnacionem ac combustionem librorum Wiclef per dive memorie Sbinconem archiepiscopum Pragensem . . . iniquam et iniustam clamabant . . . e quibus unus tractatulum dicti Wiclef . . . in suo actu publico defendendo . . . usus est prosopopeia . . . hiis eum allocutus est verbis. Dic queso mi tractatule, ob quam condempnatus es causam ? etc. . . ."

3.

Prokop of Pilsen defends Wiclif's tractate De ideis (1410, July 31).

Magistri Procopii de Plzna defensio tractatus De ideis magistri Wykleph.[1]

(*Cod. pal. Vindob.* 4002, fol. 18—23.)

"Quia plurimi contra magistrum Iohannem Wycleff sunt in tantum exacerbati, quod ipsum hereticum et eius libros hereticos esse dicunt quia autem ego hanc ascendi kathedram, eo quod hoc prout intimavi hoc[2] videlicet, quod tractatus De ideis magistri Iohannis Wycleph nullam heresim firmiter asserit nec aliquem errorem fidem katholicam inpugnantem, scolastice volo defendere: ne ergo ex defectu mee protestacionis in me aliquam accipiant scandali occasionem, publice protestor, quod in nullo actu meo preterito, presenti ac futuro intendebam nec intendo pertinacitur ex animo aliquid asserere et defendere, quod est contra fidem ecclesie aut contra determinacionem unius sancte apostolice ecclesie aut contra sacram scripturam a spiritu sancto revelatam, quod sit quovis modo falsum erroneum aut hereticum. Quod si aliquid huiusmodi dixerim et defenderim aut dixero et defendero, ego habeo pro non dicto. Et rogo, ut non pertinacie sed mee ignorancie ascribatur. Protestor eciam, quod hic sto in kathedra prout intimavi ad defendendum scolastice contra condempnatores librorum, quod tractatus De ideis magistri Iohannis Wykleff nullam heresim firmiter asserit nec aliquem erorem fidem katholicam inpugnantem, et paratus sum informari et si de opposito doctus fuero, revocando si opus fuerit emendari. Qui igitur estis hic (presentes[3]) publici notarii, ego vestrum requiro officium, ut ad meam intimacionem, protestacionem et hanc stacionem ad defendendum et cetera, que michi opportuna fuerint, prothocolum aut

[1] Title, as also in No. 1, according to *Cod. Univ. Prag.* X. E. 24, fol. 135 *b*.

[2] In *Cod.*: "huiusmodi."

[3] Is wanting there.

prothocola et demum publicum instrumentum aut instrumenta si opus fuerit conficiatis.

"Ista premissa protestacione vestra omnium cognoscat caritas, quod quemadmodum si quis puteum campos deliciarum irrigantem, unde profectus plurimi politie orerentur, obscuraret aut cooperiendo quomodolibet sopire niteretur, ille merito in hoc iniusto operis onere a militibus aut ceteris officio protegendi rempublicam fungentibus eciam vi gladii corporei esset inpugnandus: sic proporcionaliter veritates katholicas, methaphysicas, philosophicas, logicas et ceteras quaslibet ut aliquas sapiencie vivas corda hominum erumpentes, ariditatis ignoranciam dulciter irrigantes pro subtiliandis ingeniis et (ad[1]) intelligendum altitudinem fidei katholice, qui certe illas nedum falsificaret verbotenus sed falsitates eas asserendas fore, realiter ab oculis hominum et mentibus funditus conaretur abstergere. Hinc digne hiis precipue, qui magistrali sunt laurea insigniti, ut veritatis tyronibus interest fortissime obviare. Cum autem heu iam (modernis) antichristinis temporibus filii quidam tenebrarum cum earundem insurgentes potestate, malum bonum et bonum malum asserentes, propter veritates predictas ipsis odibiles ecclesie tamen Christi multum proficuas obducti in devium, que sint inde secutura, non perpendentes, ad pauca tamen respicientes, de facili pronunciaverunt omnes libros magistri Iohannis Wykleff ignis voragine esse ab oculis hominum semovendos, quod et in pluribus heu actenus perfecerunt: propter quod in meo caractere magistrali et mea—que vere est modica—sciencia non confidens, sed opus nepharium mea dictante racione condempnacionis ac librorum magistri Iohannis Wykleff combustionis animadvertens et per hoc ad notam false infamie et defamacionis nostri christianissimi regni Boemie aspiciens me natura ad bonum patrie affectum impellente, summe autem considerans altarum et subtilium veritatum theologicalium, methaphysicalium, philosophicalium et logicalium a multo tempore pridem oblitarum et abiectarum, per ipsum ut spero bonum Wykleff innovatarum ymmo ut Heliam contra antichristinum dogma in

[1] Likewise wanting there. The same remark applies to all the subsequent words which are enclosed in brackets.

scriptis nobis pro magno munere traditarum et in veritate dicendo nostram Pragensem universitatem ymmo totum regnum illuminancium, illarum inquam veritatum ecclesie tam utilium sublacionem ab hominum memoria considerans, in domini sperans adiutorium, quoniam eius causa agitur, animo meo proposui et decrevi contrarium scolastice defendere pro meo posse et signanter, quod liber De ideis magistri Iohannis Wykleff nullam heresim firmiter asserit nec aliquem errorem fidem katholicam inpugnantem contra librorum magistri predicti condempnatores.

"Unde pro mea et aliorum sciencium veritatem consolatoria monicione assumo verbum Pauli Christi apostoli 12 ad Romanos sic dicentis: *Vince in bono malum.*

"Venerandi domini omnesque fratres in Christo carissimi, Paulus apostolus in tercium tractus celum, sublimatus a fonte divine sapiencie, archana Dei hauriens nobis arescentibus inde detulit nobis aquam sapiencie salutarem, quam Romanis propinans largissime, inimicis docens benefacere inter cetera ita ait: *Noli vinci a malo, sed vince in bono malum.* Sunt etenim duo rerum genera: bonum videlicet et malum, que sibi semper adversantur teste Lactancio de vero cultu dicente: *Bonorum et malorum hec est constituta natura, ut se semper oppugnent et mutuo se expellant, bonum siquidem veritatem rei, malum autem falsitatem ex convertibilitate inculcat, que sepissime alterutri nobis videtur permisceri, sic quod nostri intellectus acumine, si bonum et verum aut malum et falsum fuerit, sepissime nequimus discernere: et hoc nonnisi provenit ex defectuosa nostrum intellectum cecante condicione ut puta ignorancia, que obscurat aut intellectum obtenebrat, ut verum et bonum cognoscere non possit.* Hec certe est condicio, quare verum et bonum, falsum et malum aliquando reputatur et e contrario. Quia igitur nuper veritates pulcherrime, ut magistri mei priores luculenter ostenderunt, temere sunt condempnate ymmo et in suis signis combuste, ut eciam per eosdem patet condempnatores dicentes: Debet bonum et verum cum malo et falso comburi, cuius causam non est aliam assignare nisi aut eorum cecam racionem hec dictantem aut eorum maliciam veritates predictas ipsorum gestis contrarias detestantem aut tercio ut ipsi false asserunt, omnes libros in se manifestas hereses continere. Si primum est in causa, videlicet eorum racio

nubilo ignorancie ut cecitate obtenebrata, tunc non mirum, quod veritates eis incognitas condempnaverunt. Hoc enim est proprium voluntarie ignorantis, ut hoc quod ignorat detestetur, nam sic

Ardea culpat aquas, quia nescit ipsa natare,
Quod scit quisque colit, quod nescit spernit et odit.

O si saltem virtuosi Senece consilium in (condempnacione) de quatuor virtutibus cardinalibus advertissent, forte nunquam veritates huiusmodi condempnassent. Ait namque Seneca: *Quisquis prudenciam sequi desideras, tunc per racionem recte vivas et omnia prius preexistimes et perpenses et dignitatem rebus non ex opinione multorum sed ex eorum natura constituas. Nam scire debes, quod quedam sunt que videntur bona esse et non sunt, et que non videntur esse bona et sunt.* Et paulo post subdit: *Prudentis proprium est examinare consilia et non cito facili credulitate ad falsa prolabi.* Ecce dicit Seneca: *Probanda esse consilia et non cito facili credulitate esse eis acquiescendum.* Non mirum ergo, si condempnacioni et consilio eorum statim non credimus, quam probanda esse prius. Seneca dicit et ibidem subdit: *De dubiis non diffinias, sed suspensam tene sentenciam. Nil inexpertum affirmes.* Et assignat racionem: *Quia non omne, quod verisimile est, est statim verum et sicut sepe incredibile videtur, non continue falsum est. Crebro siquidem faciem mendacii veritas retinet, crebro siquidem mendacium specie caritatis occultatur, nam aliquociens tristem frontem alicuius et blandam adulator ostendit, sic verisimili(ter) falsitas occultatur et ut fallat vel surripiat, conatur. Si prudens cupis esse in futurum, prospectum intende et que possint contingi, animo tuo cuncta propone. Nil tibi subitum sit, sed ante te totum perspice. Nam qui prudens est, non dicit: Non putavi, quod hoc debuit fieri, quia non dubitat sed exspectat, non suspicatur sed cavet. Cuiuscunque ergo facti causam require et cum inicia invenies, exitus cogitabis, etc.* Hec Seneca.

"Certe si nostri condempnatores, qui prudentes volunt reputari, hoc consilium auscultassent, non ita velociter hos libros condempnassent neque combussissent. Hoc enim, quod eis mali et falsi colorem habere videbantur, si oculo indifferenti discussissent, procul dubio apparens eis malum bonum esse iudicassent. Si denique finem facti respectu

diligenti attendissent, utique notam licet falsam regni nostri infamiam in post longe duraturam conspexissent et ad hoc opus stultum nullatenus anhelassent, quin pocius ad lumen sapiencie et sciencie refugissent et illas veritates fore cognovissent. Nam *sapiencia* secundam prophetam 6 Ethicorum *est certissima omnium scienciarum et est cognicio rerum divinarum habens caput inter omnes alias sciencias. Ipsa nempe sapiencia seu philosophia animum sublimat et fabricat vitam, disponit acciones, regit regenda et obmittenda demonstrat.* Ait Seneca primo ad Lucilium. Si igitur ignorancia eorum huius sceleris est in causa, cur in angulis murmurantes et honori bonorum ipsos hereticando detrahentes in tenebris ignorancie palpitant ut ebrii, quo vadant ignorantes et ad scolas, ubi nos informari parati assistimus, ad conferendum non veniunt, ut veritas que ut ferrum erugine obvolutum ex consertacione argumento ut liviarum aut maleorum[1] a falsitate depurata illis et nobis pariter elucescat et ut sic squame ignorancie oculos intellectus, ne verum possit intueri, obtenebrantes et ab eorum et vestris oculis racionum mordacitate detergantur. Quod autem eorum malicia et sic consequenter ignorancia, cum *omnis malus ignorans* 2 Ethicorum, sit occasio huius nephandi operis, a signis et eorum fructibus sic suadetur. Ipsi namque sue cause proprie iudices fuere, indifferenti oculo non arbitrantes contra doctrinam philosophi primo de celo, dicit enim philosophus iudicatores secundum verbum similiter oportet esse disquisitores et arbitros pro utraque parte, sed non inimicos alterius partis. Si enim veri et iusti sunt iudices, et cum ipsi pro causa allegant, quod isti libri magistri Iohannis Wykleff in se continent hereses manifestas, cur igitur a pari vel maiori libros Aristotelis, gentilis philosophi, Averois commentatoris fidei, apostate Avicenne, Origenis, magistri sentenciarum et ceterorum doctorum et philosophorum gentilium et catholicorum (qui manifestas hereses in se continent, cur eciam libros Machomet et aliorum hereticorum),[2] nigromanticorum, geomanticorum, pyromanticorum, tyromanticorum et ceterorum talium ab universali ecclesia studere et tenere prohi-

[1] So *Codex*. We must doubtless read, "lividorum aut malevolorum."

[2] Wanting in the Vienna MS.

bitorum cur eciam libros iurium et decretalium eciam secundum eos in multis passibus falsos et abrogatos, cur denique libros Iudeorum inter nos morancium, qui notorie contra nostram fidem suas Thalmuthi id est exposiciones biblie acerbissime exacuunt, cur inquam hos omnes libros predictos nec condempnant nec comburunt? Numquid nos christiani deteriores sumus aut minoris condicionis existimus quam iudei notorii Christi crucis inimici? Libri namque predicti liberrime absque omni impedimento leguntur, disputantur, transsumuntur et defenduntur, immo quod plus est in scienciis dictorum librorum et apud christianos et apud iudeos auctoritate superiorum aut paparum aut principum persone insigniis magistralibus caracterisantur vel magistrantur. Istius autem magistri Iohannis Wykleff, qui a plurimis ut speratur bonis hominibus et signanter in Anglia doctor ewangelicus appellatur, cuius vita et conversacio communiter a pauperibus spiritu, in Deum autem divitibus in bona et sancta memoria commendatur, licet a mundi divitibus, avaris, deliciosis, lascivis, mundi gloriosis et ypocritis erroneus ymmo et hereticus verbotenus nominatur. Non est autem ob hoc mirandum, nam sucundum propheciam Christi nostri domini oportet hec sic fieri. Si enim Christum [1] tales detracciones et condempnaciones oportebat pati, quid tunc non oportet ipse Wykleff eciam pati, ymmo ex hiis bonitatis signum in eo notorie apparet, nam cuius contrarium est malum, illud est bonum, ait philosophus primo rethorice. Pravis etenim esse odiosum et bonis amorosum est signum (efficax) bonitatis unde quidem

> "Opto placere bonis pravis odiosus haberi,
> —Quis id est—quibus nisi pravis nemo placere potest.

Et Seneca de quatuor virtutibus: *lecior esto, quociens displices malis et malorum de te estimaciones pravas veram tibi laudacionem ascribe.* Istius inquam magistri Iohannis Wykleff libri nedum legi et disputari publice sed et occulte haberi prohibentur. Quid autem hoc sit in causa, credo, quod omnibus vobis liquet, cum nonnisi veritas in libris eius conscripta nostris consuetus operibus gravis et con-

[1] In *Cod.*, "ubi idem."

traria urgens nostras consciencias ut pilus in oculo et artus calceus in pede. Quicunque enim oculo indifferenti libros eius diligenter et intelligenter perlegerit, non aliud reperiet, quam quod tota eius intencio est nos in caritate viventes[1] ad primum statum ecclesie pauperem et apostolicum revocare. Sed forte aliquis diceret, philosophus cursu nature supposito locutus est quoad naturam, non ergo errores aut hereses nobis in suis libris insinuavit. Audiat autem ille beatum Augustinum, quid dicat in 8^0 de civitate dei. Dicit enim Augustinus: *Ideo quippe hos potissimum elegi, quoniam de uno deo, qui fecit celum et terram, quanto melius senserunt, tanto ceteris gloriosiores et illustriores habentur, in tantum aliis prelati iudicio posterorum, et cum Aristoteles Platonis discipulus vir excellentis ingenii et eloquio Platoni quidem impar sed multos facile superans sectam peripateticam condidisset, quod deambulans disputare consueverat plurimosque (discipulos) preclara fama excellentes*[2] *viro adhuc preceptore in suam heresim congregasset.* Ecce expresse Augustinus dicit (philosophum) in se heresim habuisse et tamen in sciencia librorum eius ex pape licencia nos sumus magistrati. Quid autem et ille diceret de libris Machomet, Iudeorum et aliorum prius nominatorum, qui non naturaliter aut aliquo colore errores et hereses in se continent sed plane perverse, false et heretice contra fidem christianam summas falsitates et hereses in se claudunt? Quare igitur rogo non comburuntur? O utinam pre oculis dampnancium obiectum fuisset Gamaleelis consilium sic dicentis: *Et nunc itaque dico vobis, discedite ab omnibus istis et sinite illos, quoniam si est ex hominibus consilium hoc aut opus, dissolvetur, si vero ex deo est, non poteritis eos dissolvere, ne forte et deo repugnare videamini,* scribitur Actuum 5. Vere quidem si hec sciencia librorum condempnata est solum modo ex hominibus, per se dissolvetur, quia mala, *malum autum se ipsum destruit* 4^0. Ethicorum, si autem est ex deo, tunc stulte et frustra sua condempnacione veritati dei videntur contraire. Nam etsi ad tempus veritas in plateis corruat, postremo tamen ipsa triumphatrix resurgit. Cum itaque (ut) firme teneo, non

[1] In *Cod.*, "unientes." The two words are graphically alike.

[2] *Ib.*, "excellentissimo."

doctus de opposito doceri tamen paratus, (quod) hac iniquitate ipsi condempnatores et combustores Deo et sue veritait insultarunt, non minus credo ut mihi videtur quam Scarioth, qui Christum, qui est via veritas et vita, Iudeis prodidit, ipsos esse ymmo pariter inculpandos. Nam in quo differunt nisi quod ille ad crucifigendum, isti vero ad comburendum veritatem tradiderunt? Spero igitur, quod ad vindicandum dominum veritatis revelabunt celi cum Iuda iniquitatem eorum et terra adversus eos consurget tunc manifesta erunt peccata eorum, qui (contra) dixerunt domino Deo et eius in scripto veritatibus. Recedite a nobis per ignis voraginem, nam scienciam viarum vestrarum [1] nolumus. Cum ergo istorum librorum condempnatores nullam causam racionabilem nec aliquem pulcrum colorem habeant hanc condempnacionem et combustionem excusantem, ne taciturnitate nostra eos in hoc scelesto opere confortare videamur aut prebere consensum, ego adherens matri mee alme Pragensi universitati, pariter secum ad hoc nephas combustionis non consencio, quin pocius contradico, et cum veritate stans que super omnia vivat, hoc malum in bono contrarietatis et non consensus presto sum convincere advertens apostoli consilium sic dicentis *vince in bono malum*. Et tantum de isto.

"Quod autem tercio nominata huius sceleris occasio, videlicet quod isti singuli libri in se continent hereses manifestas, ipsis condempnatoribus non possit subsistere, hanc contra eos quemadmodum intimavi pono conclusionem: quod tractatus De ideis magistri Iohannis Wykleff nullam firmiter asserit heresim nec aliquem errorem fidem catholicam inpugnantem. Hec conclusio ponitur primo: nam si conclusio non est vera, detur oppositum et ab adversario ostendatur, sed quia hoc non potest ostendi ut Deo auxiliante pateret, si adversarius aliquis esset presens, igitur conclusio vera. Patet eciam secundo: Nam iste tractatus De ideis habens tantum quinque capitula, in quolibet eorum ostendit principaliter ideam esse. Nam primo supponendo, quid nominis idee, inquirit, an idea est et consequenter ponit ideas esse et ad hoc adducendo raciones et auctoritates dissolvit raciones ideas inprobantes et demum de-

[1] In *Cod.*: "Scientiam vestram."

clarat modum essendi idearum. (Sed quod ista posicio racionum pro et contra idearum)[1] nullam heresim aut errorem firmiter asserit fidem catholicam inpugnantem, hoc de se patet. Nam si universaliter, fere omnes libri doctorum et disputaciones theologice ponentes argumenta pro fide et contra hereses astruerent, quod est manifeste falsum. Quod autem ponere ideas esse non sit erroneum aut hereticum, patet per Augustinum libro 83 Questionum q. 47 sic dicentem : *Idea est forma exemplaris eterna, secundum quam Deus est productivus creature a dextra.* Patet autem ideas esse ex scriptura veteris et novi testamenti, Genesis enim primo dicitur : Dixit deus Fiat lux etc. ubi expresse Augustinus secundo super Genesim dicit : *Cum ergo audimus Fiat, intelligamus, quod in verbo dei erat sanctibilitas, quam ideam esse dicit.* Et Eccles. 42. cap.° sic ait : *Magnalia sapiencie sue decoravit, qui est ante seculum et usque in seculum et sequitur : Omnia hec vivunt et manent in seculum.* Quod postillantes exponunt, quod omnia vivunt in suis racionibus intelligilibus. Hoc idem eciam patet in novo testamento Iohannis primo : *Quod factum est in ipso scilicet*[2] *per ideam, vita erat* et Paulus apostolus ex visione dei archanorum ad Rom. 13. dicit. : *Ex ipso, per ipsum et in ipso sunt omnia* et ad Corinthos 15. *Deus est omnia et in omnibus, id est, deus est omnes raciones ideales, id est, in omnibus creaturis.* Ad Hebreos vero 11. dicit : *Fide intelligimus aptata esse secula verbo dei, ut ex invisibilibus specie seculis exemplaribus visibilia fierent.* Patet eciam ideas esse per doctores et philosophos catholicos et gentiles ymmo secundum Augustinum *nemo sapiens esse potest, qui ideas non intellexerit.* Dicit enim 83 questionum questione 46 : *Non est, verisimile esse sapientes ante Platonem istas res quas Plato ideas vocat non intellexisse, cum si quidem in eis tanta vis constituitur, quod nisi hiis intellectis sapiens esse nemo possit.* Et sequitur ; *Sunt autem idee principales (quedam) forme vel raciones rerum stabiles atque incommutabiles atque ipse formate non sunt et per hoc eterne et semper eodem modo se(se) habentes, secundum eas tamen formari dicitur omne, quod oritur vel interit.* Item idem Augustinus Omelia

[1] *Ib.*, wanting.
[2] In *Cod.* : "Specie."

prima super Iohannem et quarto de Trinitate expresse ponit ideas. Signanter eciam primo Retraccionum ita scribit: *Mundum quippe intelligibilem Plato nuncupavit, ipsam racionem sempiternam atque incommutabilem, qua fecit deus mundum, quam qui esse negat, sequitur, ut dicat deum irracionabiliter fecisse, quod fecit aut cum faceret aut antequam faceret, nescivisse quid faceret, si apud deum racio faciendi non erat.* Sanctus autem Thomas de Aquino super primo Sentenciarum distinccione 36 q. 2, diffuse tractans per raciones ostendit ideas esse et inter cetera allegat Augustinum in libro de Civitate dei sic dicentem: *Qui negat ideas est infidelis.* Patet eciam ideas esse per beatum Dionysium, Anselmum, doctorem profundum Lyncolniensem, Boetium, Platonem, Senecam et plures alios philosophos katholicos et gentiles, quos gracia brevitatis obmitto allegare. Sequitur igitur questionem esse veram. Sed ex iam dictis contra condempnatores sic arguitur divisive: istius namque tractatus De ideis condempnatores et combustores aut negant ideas aut non negant. Si negant tunc secundum sanctum Thomam, Augustinum allegantem sunt infideles. Si autem non negant, vel ergo ideas intelligunt vel non intelligunt. Si non intelligunt, tunc sunt stulti, nam condempnaverunt et combusserunt scienciam huius tractatus De ideis quam non intelligunt. Patet hoc idem ut supra per Augustinum dicentem *nisi ideas intelligat, sapiens esse nemo potest.* Sequitur igitur, quod sint stulti et insipientes et quomodo rogo non intelligentes ideas sapientes esse possunt cum sapiencia 8^0 Ethicorum est cognicio rerum divinarum et altissimarum causarum, que sunt idee res exemplariter concreantes. Si vero ydeas intelligunt et cognoscunt, tunc ex eorum insana condempnacione blasphemi esse videntur, nam idee sicut et alie veritates quadruplex habent esse, unum esse reale in mente divina, alia autem tria esse in signo videlicet mentali, creato vocali et scripto. Et quia hii condempnatores nedum os in celum sed et bracchium suum usque in mentem dei ad ideas suas concreatores extendentes et de dei menti ab esse earum reali eripere non valentes, quid saltem in eis est, in signis vocalibus loqui et predicare verbum dei de eis prohibentes, in signis scriptis combusserunt. Vere similitudinarie, ut si quis imaginem crucifixi in contemptum christianis aut regis

nostri in Boemorum contemptum incenderet, ille in Christum vel et (in) regem et nos blasphemare videretur : sic igitur et ipsi raciones divinas ipsorum factrices exemplares in signis ocularibus ipsas contempnendo comburentes videntur esse blasphemi, igitur etc. ymaginari nobis has res, prohibere autem[1] non possunt nisi si nos deducerent in corruptelam. O quantum scelus perpetratum vere multo dignum inproperio, ut si non ad piam monicionem, saltem ad diram correpcionem huius operarii abiecta obstinacia ad penitudinem reducatur. O deus inimicis veritatum cur ipsas dispensandas permittis ? Quomodo queso stulti de sapiencia blasphemi et infideles bene possunt de veritatibus katholicis arbitrari ? Quomodo eciam rogo grossus et inexpertus rusticus lapidis auro permixto pensare potest preciositatem, cum magistri aurifodinarum experti per difficile ignis agentes examen vix eius pensam valent cognoscere. Sicut ergo quid asino ad liram, cum cytharisare nesciat, eciamsi cythara comburatur, minime curat, sic quid inexperto bubulco aut experto ceco ad pensandum aurum veritatis, cum neuter eorum ipse valeat discernere ? Non his ergo cecis et inexpertis aurum datur ad examinandum sed bene videntibus et expertis. Quod si datur, quid faciunt, nisi ut porci conculcant pulcherrimas margaritas ? Sicut eciam in locis cauponum aut sutorum aurum non examinatur, sed in focis aurifabrorum, sic non ubilibet aurum veritatis comprobatur sed in lectoribus et aulis ut fornacibus universitatum. Universitates sunt enim tanquam aurifodine, in quibus sepius ut purum aurum veritates plane aliquando vero luto falsitatis apparenter permixte de profundis mencium abissis graviter effodiuntur, ubi aurum veritatis igne argumentorum examinatur certeque septuplum expurgature.[2]

"Veniant igitur ad huius scole fornaces hii, qui aurum veritatis lutum heresis et falsitatis esse dicunt, si ita se habeat ad scolastice examinandum, cur erubescunt si bene sunt operati ? Nam ut dicit philosophus 2° Rethorice : de bono opere nullus erubescere debet.

---

[1] In *Cod.*, "autem" stands after "imaginari."

[2] In the *Cod. Prag.* the order of the propositions is given incorrectly.

"Signum autem mali operis aut eorum trepide timiditatis est eorum absentacio. Nam ad lucem exire nequeunt sed in tenebris latitant, ut eorum mala non arguantur opera. Nichilominus tamen a plurimis publice increpantur. Veniant inquam ad conferendum, ut nobis et ipsis pateant veritates. Nos autem singula probantes malum abicientes, quod bonum est teneamus et malo eorum consensum non prebentes nec eis in malo obedientes eos ut inimicos diligamus sic tamen, ut eorum errores non amemus, sed quoniam in Christo baptismate fratres nostri sint, eis compatiamur et dominum pro ipsis invocemus, si forsitan convertantur et agant penitenciam, ut vitam consequamur pariter sempiternam, quam nobis Christus tribuat in secula seculorum benedictus. Amen."

In the Vienna MS. there follows the additional remark: "Quia anno domini 1410, decima sexta die mensis Julii, que fuit feria quarta in illa syllaba post Arnolphus, etc., in Praga in curia archiepiscopali libri magistri Iohannis Wycleff sunt combusti, ideo predicta replicacio fuit facta eodem anno die ultimo mensis Julii, que fuit feria quinta in illa syllaba Don. Pet. Steph. Steph."

Regarding the time at which the address was delivered, compare also the "Chronicon universitatis Pragensis" in Höfler, *Geschichtschr.*, i. 22: "Magister Procopius de Plzna feria quinta[1] stabit in cathedra ad defendendum scolastice, quod tractatus De ideis magistri Iohannis Wicleff nullam heresim firmiter asserit nec errorem fidem catholicam impugnantem."

4.

Zdislaw of Zwierzeticz defends Wiclif's tractate, *De universalibus* (1410, August 6th).

Domini Zdislai de Zwierzeticz pro libro universalium.

(*Cod. pal. Vindob.* 4002, fol. 24*a*—27 *a*).

"Quia secundum dictum Senece in libro de beneficiis *ingratitudo est vicium, quo homo ingratus est deo aut homini*

[1] That is more correct than "hora quinta"; it tallies better also with the data given elsewhere. Jacobus of Mies reads "feria secunda (= 28th July). Procopius of Pilsen on the 31st July (thus = "feria quinta).

de beneficiis acceptis, ne ergo istud diabolicum incurrerem vicium, quia a Deo accepi gratis omnia que habeo et a magistro Iohanne Wyklef tamquam a Dei instrumento accepi multam scienciam et presertim de universalibus realibus, que sunt cause efficaces, formales et finales individuorum universi, sine quibus non potest ipsum universum consistere, sicut necessario simpliciter est una universalissima causa in se pluribus suppositis communicata, quam eciam gentiles philosophi Deum vocaverunt, attribuentes ei numerum trinarium, sicut tangit philosophus 1°. Celi, et per consequens vocantes Deum quamvis obscure, cum non fuerint illuminati fidei lumine, trinitatem pro presenti ad honorem eiusdem trinitatis et pro gratitudine veritatis universalium, quam cognovi, ascendi cathedram adversus venerabilem in Christo dominum Sbinkonem archiepiscopum Pragensem nec non adversus eius pretensam sentenciam et combustionem stultam librorum valde utilium et adversus condempnatores et omnes ex consensu condempnacionis participes, paratus audire, ut ipse dominus Sbinko vel alius de condempnatoribus ostendat publice, quam manifestam heresim liber magistri Iohannis Wyklef de universalibus realibus, propter quam predictum librum condempnarunt et combusserunt, cum tamen in valde solempni universitate Oxoniensi practizatur, legitur et tenetur publice. Que universitas magistrorum doctorum et aliarum personarum excessit numero personarum numerum eorum, qui fuerunt in condempnacionis synodo eciam connumeratis omnibus, qui ad huiusmodi sentenciam nullo modo consenserunt. Cum igitur prefata Oxoniensis solempnis universitas prefatum librum de Universalibus pro katholico legat et teneat, volui eidem universitati veritate tractus pocius quam eiusdem libri condempnatoribus conformari. Alias enim grave ingratitudinis et demencie vicium incurrerem, cum philosophus suadet non solum de veris sed eciam de falsis inventis reddere grates. Et ipsi videant, qui ingrati de tam nobili universalium sciencia non sunt grati, alii dissimulantes, alii non recolentes, alii defensionem non reddentes, alii velud filii Efrem conversi in artum pravum malum pro bono reddentes, impulsi verbo adulacionis vel buccella panis vel timore leporino casum folii ad ventum fugientes: Hii certe sunt immemores beneficii

accepti, ingrati et scelesti. Quorum ingratitudinem ostendens Seneca in libro de beneficiis ponit tres gradus dicens: *Ingratus est qui dissimulat, ingracior qui non reddit, sed omnium ingratissimus, qui beneficium non recolit sed oblitus est. Et certe potest superaddi, quod super omnes illos ingratissimo ingracior est, qui pro beneficio malum reddit.* Unde in primo gradu sunt, qui accepta magna sciencia veritatis de Universalibus magistri Iohannis Wyklef dissimulant veritatem; in secundo gradu sunt, qui bonum sibi pro veritate quam didicerunt non retribuunt, in tercio gradu sunt, qui iam beneficii gradum non recolunt, in quarto, qui malum pro bono retribuunt, sicut sunt impugnatores et combustores, qui pro informacione et labore condempnacionem et combustionem libris, qui non peccaverunt, tamquam peccantibus ministrarunt. Vere tales combustores propter racionem quam assignant, deberent totum mundum comburere, nam racio combustionis eorum hec est: In libris magistri Iohannis Wyklef continentur manifesta heresis et errores, igitur sunt singuli comburendi. A simili arguitur sic: In mundo continetur manifesta heresis et errores, igitur mundus est comburendus. Consequencia est eorum et maius est tam verum immo verius, quam eorum, cum impossibile sit in libris magistri Iohannis Wyklef contineri manifestam heresim et errores nisi in mundo ipsa heresis sit contenta. Immo si racio eorum efficaciter ad eorum velle procederet, omnes homines errantes combureret, cum in omnibus errantibus hominibus sunt hereses et errores. Cur ergo non comburunt errantes focarias, cur non comburunt Iudeos, qui manifeste negant Iesum Christum dominum esse Deum et per consequens pertinaciter et sic heretice negant legem eius et dogmatizant, quod lex Christi non est vera? Cur non comburunt illud dictum in biblia: Iesus est seductor, Iesus blasphemat, Iesus demonium habet, Iesus non est homo a Deo, quia sabbatum non custodivit, Iesus insanit, Iesus prohibet tributa dari cesari? Ecce ista sunt scripta in libro biblie et notum, quod qui ea cum Iudeis pariter teneret, blasphemus esset. Numquid ergo debet biblia comburi? Et patulum est, quod nullo modo. Unde si secunda racio eorum procederet, quam arguunt sicut in bulla asserunt, quod libri Wyklef multorum corda infecerunt, ergo sunt comburendi: tunc sequitur quod omnes homines,

qui aliorum corda immo propria infecerunt, sunt comburendi. Sed rogo, quis tunc ex combustoribus immo ex nobis omnibus remaneret pro tempore incombustus? Si quis est ille, mittat in me primus lapidem et hoc cum iuste fecerit, concedam sibi de facili, quod ad combustionem iuste consensit. Sed credo, quod non cito quis hoc faciet, donec de singulis suis operibus et combustione reddat supremo domino racionem. Et si volunt domino debitam racionem reddere, primo colant sive cribrent suam conscienciam, an hoc fecerint in affectu caritatis intimo vel magis ex affectu odii in confusionem subdolam personarum. Cribrent secundo propriam intelligenciam et videant, cur antiquorum patrum sentencias condempnarunt. Non enim moderni sed antiqui sancti et gentiles philosophi universalia realia posuerunt. Ut taceam de gentilibus, proferam in memoriam Augustinum, Damascenum, Hilarium, Orosium, quos sequens venerabilis Anselmus ait, quod non estimantes universales substancias preter flatum vocis non sunt dialectici sed dialectice hereteci. Horum enim sentencias magister Iohannes Wyklef in libro de Universalibus in memoriam reduxit, que fuerunt per signorum et vocum doctores ad aliquod tempus in aliquibus logicis iam sopite ut in combustoribus, quorum aliqui usque hodie nescirent dicere, quid est universale reale: genus, sensus vel differencia et in Biridamistis et in Ockamistis, qui vocaliter negant universalia realia. Que non possunt comburere, quamvis sua scripta universalia combusserunt. Sed rogo, queratur ab eis, que utilitas inde effloruit? Quis parvulus in illa combustione lactabitur? Quis adultus uberius cibabitur? Quis perfectus affluencius delectabitur? Surgant didascalici quadruviales, cum logicis hauriant profectum in combustione, que veritates logicas, philosophicas, naturales et morales in scripto voragine consumpsit. Surgant arithmetici, musici, mathematici et astronomici et hauriant, quod in magistri Iohannis Wyklef libro de Ypocritis est consumptum. Surgant mathematici et subtiles theologi et revocent, quod in libro de Attributis de facili exusserunt. Sed nec forte conturbari debent, quia combustores meliores et subtiliores eis component. Nam dicunt, quod in illis libris et logica et philosophia fuit perversa et sic intendunt convertere omnino falsum elidere et tantum verum posteris propinare. Veniant ergo: convertant

falsum et verum, repudient falsum, demonstrent verum, sequantur veritatem, quam ego desidero et sto ad cathedram volens eam defendere, ne sim percussor sentencie antiquorum, sicut enim fecit Theorinus philosophus catholicus, presul vir rectitudine famosissimus, quem impellebant orientales episcopi, ut ad condempnacionem—licet non ad combustionem librorum Origenis consentiret. Qui eciam respondit omnibus: *Eius qui dudum bene requiescit, iniurias non fero, ne rem blasphemam temptare presumam dampnans ea, que priores nostri respuere noluerunt.* Et beatus Ieronymus de ipso Origene, cuius libros libentissime legebat, dicit *se multam accepisse sciencíam de libris eius non condempnans simul omnia propter aliqua erronea.* Unde dicit in laudem Origenis sic: *Ego Origenem propter erudicionem sic interdum legendum arbitror, quomodo Tertullianum et Novatum, Arnobium et Apollinarem et nonnullos ecclesiasticos scriptores Grecos pariter et Latinos, ut eorum bona eligamus vitemusque contraria iuxta apostolum dicentem: Omnia probate, que bona sunt retinete.* Hec ad Tranquillium. Item dicit in laudem Origenis sic: *Imitabor Originem, quem post apostolos ecclesiarum magistrum nemo nisi imperitus negat. Inter cetera enim preclara sui monimenta in hoc laboravit, ut quod Philo quasi iudeus obmiserat, hic ut christianus impleret.* Hec beatus Ieronymus.

"Quo pacto ergo nostri nunc condempnatores et combustores istos tam preclaros ecclesie philosophos non sunt in facto simili ut asserunt imitati? Et tantum primo:

"Cur autem tam concite festinarunt libros comburere, videtur ignorancia precipitans et invidia ignis fomentum conferens ad combustionem ipsos tam subitam impulisse. Diu siquidem quosdam ingratos temerarios agitabat invidia, quos complexe significalibus et conceptibus chimereis fantasia graviter occuparat, unde ut audivi, quamvis nondum presens fui, sepe replicacionibus deductis per magistros multorum iuvenum immo et magistrorum acuebantur ingenia, sed ex prevalencia sentencie universalium realium invidia succrescebat, unde coadunata iam effulsit aliqualiter, sed nondum per omnia habet finem. Cum autem veritas sit fortissima vincens super omnia, manifestum est, quod invidiam finaliter

superabit. Est autem veritas duplex, scilicet increata et creata. Increata que est prima veritas . . . [1]

. . . "Sed quidquid dicit spiritus sanctus, est infallibilis veritas, cum spiritus sanctus sit Deus, qui mentiri non potest, ergo maius verum. Ex isto ulterius sequitur, quod nulli puro homini nec alicui multitudini est credendum irrefragabiliter, nisi ille homo vel illa multitudo docuerit vel suum dictum fundaverit in hac triplici veritate primo in veritate sacre scripture, secundo in veritate racione elaborata vel tercio in veritate experimentaliter cognita.

"Ex quo ulterius sequitur, quod condempnatoribus tractatus de Universalibus magistri Iohannis Wyklef non est credendum, quod dictus tractatus manifestam contineat heresim, nisi ostenderint sacra scriptura vel racione vel veritate experimentaliter cognita, ubi et que sit in dicto tractatu illa heresis manifesta. Quod si sint veritatis amici et amici mei sinceriores,[2] non abscondant veritatem sub modio, sed ponant in candelabrum cathedre, ut qui ingrediuntur, lumen veritatis valeant intueri. Meminerint dicti allegati : Quia si amicus et veritas dissenciant, sanctum est prehonorare veritatem Si ergo sanctum est prehonorare veritatem, malignum est prehonorare falsitatem. Veritas enim si ab aliquo non defenditur, opprimitur, maxime dum cognita veritas propter timorem servilem mundanum vel humanum residet non defensa.

"Cum autem noticia universalium realium est scala, per quam ascenditur in noticiam benedicte ac increate trinitatis, prout deducit magnus logicus s. Anshelmus dicens : *Qui non potest concipere, quomodo tres homines participacione sunt unus homo, quomodo in illa secretissima et altissima re cognoscet, quomodo tres persone sunt unus Deus ?* Et qui non scit cognoscere, quomodo commune est omni homini esse homo, quomodo cognoscet, quomodo commune est omni persone divine esse Deum ?

"Scit namque realis et verus logicus christianus, quod unus Deus tribus communicatur personis, cum tres persone

[1] This thought is further carried out. It occurs, however, farther on, so that in its expansion it may be left out at this place.

[2] In *Cod.* : "sinceres."

sunt unus Deus, una communis essencia, una deitas, quomodo a posteriori licet non per omnia similiter tres homines sunt unus homo communis, ut dicit Por(phiri)us : *una essencia, una species humana producta in essencia, in qua participant singuli homines, cum sint partes subiective eiusdem essencie, que est species humana.*[1]

"Hanc autem scalam cognicionis tradidit magister Iohannes Wyklef in suo libro de Universalibus volens Christi fideles per sanctorum dicta et presertim per sacre scripture exempla manuducere in cognicionem altissimarum causarum et sacratissime trinitatis.

"Illum ergo librum in suis veritatibus nuper condempnatum et combustum in suis literis volo defendere et sto ad defendendum more scolastico evocans ad ostensionem manifeste heresis, si qua continetur, ipsos condempnatores omnes simul et quemlibet singulariter, ut veniant vel veniat ad memoriam et ostendant vel ostendat publice heresim in prefato libro manifestam, quod si non fecerint, vel nullus eorum fecerit, manifeste patebit, quod sine causa racionabili sed pretense et iniuste dictum librum de Universalibus condempnarunt et combusserunt contra Deum et iusticiam in confusionem nostre universitatis et tocius regni Boemie detrimentum.[2]

---

[1] *The Chronicon Univ. Prag.* observes regarding this lecture : "Zdislaus de Wartenberk, alias de Zwierzeticz, Magister artium liberalium studii universitatis Pragensis proxima feria quarta ad octo dies (6 Aug.) hora undecima stabit in cathedra paratus ad defendendum librum magistri Iohannis Wiclef in materia de Universalibus contra venerabilem dominum Sbynconem archiepiscopum Pragensem et eius sententiam impugnantes." The last lecture, delivered by Giczin, is singularly enough not mentioned by the *University Chronicle*. See *Docum*, 400.

[2] There now follows in the MS. : "Tres sunt qui testimonium dant," *i.e.*, the defence of Hus made on behalf of Wiclif's book *De Trinitate*. The last mentioned is, for the rest, not specified in the Vienna Palace MS. 4002. There the tractate of Hus is comprehended in one with that of Zdislaw.

Selection from the defence made by John of Giczin.

Gyczin pro tractatu materie et forme.

(*Cod. pal. Vind.* 4002, fol. 33—38.)

"... Cum dicitur in sentencia contra libros magistri Iohannis Wycleff prolata et contra eius libros habentes ... communicato nobis magistrorum in theologia ... quia omnes et singulos et quemlibet singulariter qui habuerint vel habuerit libros vel librum magistri Iohannis Wycleff vel qui sciverint vel sciverit et infra sex dies non reposuerint vel reposuerit, excommunicat et sic regem et alios principes, barones et milites excommunicat prefata sentencia. Immo cum multi de condempnatoribus adhuc aliquos habent tractatulos ... simulatam sanctitatem discuciens, confutans ad auxilium omnipotentis domini me convertam ...

"Attende domine et considera ... libros magistri Iohannis Wycleff tam subito combusserunt, da eis retribucionem debitam et in adiutorium meum intende primo, ut eorum mandato non obediam, secundo, ut eorum excommunicacionem quoad dampnacionem perpetuam non timeam, tercio ut combustionem nocivam debite reprehendam et quarto, ut constanter defendam in libro de Materia et forma magistri Iohannis Wycleff agnitam veritatem ...[1]

"Ecce hiis sanctorum testimoniis fundatis in lege Christi convincuntur temerarii iudices it condempnatores, qui se de Dei iudicio occulto blaspheme intromittunt dicentes, quod magister Iohannes Wycleff est dampnatus in inferno. Utinam istum clamorem audientes primo ad infernum descenderent, si ita in opere est completum et tunc nobis annunciarent.

"Quidam tamen consensor condempnacionis et clamoris illius particeps (Iohannes Peclo)[2] asserit se sic ascendisse et fuisse in inferno et vidisse ipsum Wicleff, sed

[1] With this the table of contents is exhausted. There follows the usual formula of protestation.

[2] Written on the margin by the same hand, in red ink. On Johannes Peklo, see *Doc.* 178.

quia caret testibus, ideo pro tam temerario mendacio sibi minus in aliis est credendum.

"Probent illa duo condempnatores et combustores scilicet, quod Wycleff eternaliter est dampnatus, secundo quod tractatus suus de Materia et forma contineat manifestam heresim, et dum hec duo probaverint, tunc eorum condempnacionem et combustionem pariter approbabo. Sed credo, quod prius singuli una mecum stabunt ad discretum singulare iudicium racionem de suis reddentes operibus, quam dampnacionem magistri Iohannis Wycleff et combustionem, quod fuit licita, comprobabunt.

VII.

The Appeal of Hus to the Pope.

[Page 115.]

"Appellacio Ioannis Hus ab archiepiscopo ad papam.

Hist. et monum. Io. Hus, i., fol. 91 *b*. *Doc. mag. Ioh. Hus*, 387—396.

"Demum siquidem nobilis et famosus vir dominus Ioannes Mulheym . . . ac eciam discretus vir Crux institor, civis Pragensis olim divina inspiracione provide considerantes, quod licet in civitate Pragensi multa loca existerent ecclesiastica pro usu divini cultus ordinata, illa tamen per plures alios actus sacros adeo occupantur, quod nullus locorum eorundem privilegiatus ad predicacionis verbi Dei ministerium ibidem specialiter esset deputatus, sed predicantes in vulgari Boemico, quod ibi naturale existit, plerumque per domos et latebras cogerentur divagari . . .

"Donatio Ioannis de Mülheim."

MM. Hist. un. Prag., tom. ii., p. 300.

"Igitur ego Ioannes de Mülheim . . .

" . . . provida consideratione pensans . . . quomodo in civitate Pragensi, licet multa sint loca ad divinos cultus ordinata, nichilominus tamen eadem per plurimos sacros actus occupantur pluries, quod nullus locus ad privilegiatum verbi Dei officium sit ibidem specialiter deputatus sed predicantes ipsi specialiter vulgaris Boemici eloquii plerumque per domos et latebras coguntur, quod non congruit, divagari . . .

"... prefatus civis quandam aream sive certum locum ad hoc congruum et honestum prope parrochialem ecclesiam sanctorum Philippi et Iacobi apostolorum Pragensium et infra eius parrochiam consistentes, quem idem civis legitime acquisivit, et quem Bethlehem nuncupari censuit, pro usu predicacionis verbi Dei huiusmodi pia largicione donavit ipsique miles et civis quandam capellam in honorem et sub nomine sanctorum Innocentum ...

"... capellam novam in honore sanctum Innocentum in area providi viri Crucis civis, ... quam idem donavit ... sita ... iuxta ecclesiam sanctorum Philippi et Jacobi apostolorum in dicta civitate Pragensi, quam Bethlehem ... censui appellandam ..."

Hus, in his appeal, points to the confirmatory document of King Wenzel of 2nd September, 1391 (M.M. ii., 314), the document of the Archbishop of Prague, John (of Jenzenstein) of 27th June, 1391 (M.M. ii., 308), and the above quoted deed of gift on the part of John of Mühlheim.

VIII.

ANSWER OF BENESCH, PREACHER AT THE CHURCH IN PRAGUE, TO A (LOST) LETTER OF HUS: THAT THE LATTER AS AN ADHERENT OF WICLIF HAS COME UNDER THE ECCLESIASTICAL PUNISHMENT.

(OF THE PERIOD, 1411—1413.)

Epistola Benessii.

(*E cod. pal. Vindob.* 4941, fol. 238 *b*—239 *a*.)

"Sequitur epistola pulchra a vero katholico domino Benessio[1] predicatore in ecclesie Pragensi directa ipsi heresiarche Hus.

"Gloriosus deus pius Iesus det tibi non plus quam oportet sapere et augmentum orthodoxe fidei et in futuro gloriam sempiternam. Cupiens tibi exprobranti mihi re-

[1] It is the same Benesch who also plays a part among the accusers of Hus. *Doc. mag. Hus*, 179.

spondere verbum, miror vehemencius, cur me fratrem tuum appellas, cum me scias filium esse sancte matris ecclesie, cuius tu non vis esse filius. Ymmo tantam matrem tantorum filiorum letantem tu conturbas et quantum in te est, rursum eius scindis viscera et dolores eius renovas, quos in adolescencia sua et in principio fidei habuit. Quorum iam dolorum oblita fuit cum illa muliere ewangelica, postquam multos filios parturiverat. De te igitur et de tibi similibus dicit Salomon in prov. 9⁰: *Stultus filius est mestícia matris sue.* Videbis igitur, in quem transfixisti. Ad hoc vero, quod obicis mihi temerarium iudicium, sicut est vobis omnibus communissimum et consuetissimum catholicos exprobrare de temerario iudicio ducentes auctoritates: *Nolite iudicare*, ad hoc respondeo, quod non iudico sed iudicata sequor. Numquid iudico quemquam, cum dico, quod omnes iudei, gentiles et heretici et qui scripserunt heresim et non retractaverunt sicut Wikleph et mortui sunt, sunt de dampnandis? Nonne hec dicens sequor iudicium salvatoris dulcis Iesu dicentis: *Qui non credit, iam iudicatus est.* Ecce Augustinus est, qui scribens ad Petrum de fide sic dicit: *Firmissime tene—que ducit ad mortem.*[1] Hec Augustinus. Ex predictis patet, quod nos catholici neminem iudicamus, sed sequimur iudicata. Sed tu es, qui omnes vivos et mortuos doctores iudicas et a nemine vis iudicari, omnes doces et a nemine vis doceri, novas vias in fide catholica inveniens et veteres ac decreta sanctorum patrum contempnis faciens contra dictum Salomonis d. proverb. 22: *Ne transgrediaris terminos antiquos, quos posuerunt patres tui.*

"Ad hoc vero, quod dicis et supponis, quod ego sciam te esse in sentenciis, propter hoc, quod tu correxisti crimina cleri dissoluti, sicut tu asseris, ad hoc respondeo, quod erras et falsum supponis, quia ego te scio innodatum esse sentenciis papalibus propter hoc, quod es sator et sectator secte Wiclefonis heretici condempnati et hec est assercio et vox omnium katholicorum virorum et mulierum, clericorum et laícorum, sed tu dando excusaciones in peccatis[2] dicis te propter satiricas predicaciones

[1] The long passage is here only indicated by its first and its last words.

[2] Probably "impertinentes."

contra clerum esse sentenciis innodatum. Sed in hoc veritatem non dicis cum falsis Susanne testibus, sed nec mirum, quia propriissimum est mentiri Wiklefistis.

"Ad ultimum vero punctum respondeo, licet responsionem non mereatur dicens, quod probabilius propter unum scismaticum interdictum ponitur quam propter mille demonia. Et racio est, quod unus hereticus sive scismaticus plus potest nocere ecclesie sancte dei, quam demonia infinita, quia secundum Haymonem plures sunt diaboli fideles impugnantes quam atomi radio in solari, et tamen propter eos non cessatur a divinis, sed propter hereticos et scismaticos. Redi igitur perverse seductor animarum ad cor et age penitenciam de tanta superbia et malicia, que maior est, quam fuit Luciperi in celi patria, et consequeris in presenti graciam et in futuro gloriam sempiternam."

IX.

Letter of the M. Stanislas of Znaim, to Katharine of Kravar, against Wiclifism.

[To p. 160.]

"Transsumptum epistole, quam magister *Stanislaus de Znoyma* sacre theologie professor transmisit nobili mulieri domine *N.* relicte quondam domini *Petri de Plumpnaw*,[1] et in eadem continenter ea, que sunt contra Hussitas pessimos hereticos desperatos, maledictos et eternaliter dampnatos.[2]

"Oracionibus et serviciis utinam valentibus aliquid in domino cordialiter premissis. Nobilis et generosa domina. Primum et precipue commendare debeo dominacioni vestre fidem catholicam, id est communem, que est communis fides communitatis christianorum semper et ubique

[1] Peter of Kravar, dictus de Plumnow, head chamberlain of the Olmütz Cuda (see Landtafel von Mähren, Olmützer Cuda, lib. 7, p. 260), died in 1411. Peter's wife was called Katharina, of Meissau; vid. Beck, *Gesch. der Stadt Neutitschein*.

[2] Manifestly titular superscription of later date.

tenta per totam sanctam dei ecclesiam ubique terrarum, quam fidem beatus Augustinus commendat ita dicens: *Nulle sunt maiores divicie, nulli thesauri. . . .*

"Secundo gracie vestre notificare debeo, quod si homo omnes partes et omnes articulos et omnia puncta fidei et veritatis catholice teneret et crederet, propter hoc, quod unicum punctum erroneum et hereticum teneret et crederet firmiter, non volens ab illo recedere, tunc sua credulitas totalis non esset fidelis catholica et christiana, sed infidelis erronea et diabolica, privans honorem precioso thesauro scilicet fide catholica, quam superius beatus Augustinus ita commendat. Sicut si homo diceret mille vera fidelia et catholica et admisceret unum falsum erroneum et hereticum, totale suum dictum per illud venenum immixtum esset corruptum falsum erroneum et hereticum.

"Tercio magnificencie vestre debeo manifestare, quod quicunque vult securus esse in tenendo et possidendo illum preciosum thesaurum in terris scilicet fidem catholicam, ille teneat et credat hoc totum, quod et credit tenet dicit et docet teneri sancta Romana ecclesia, que est domina et mater omnium ecclesiarum, ubi supremus iudex in causa fidei est papa et summi assessores sunt totum collegium cardinalium et nequaquam teneat et credat aliud circa materiam fidei et veritatis catholice quam illud, quod sancta ecclesia Romana credit et tenet, dicit et docet credere. Quia quidquid illa circa materiam fidei et veritatem christianam credit et tenet, dicit et docet, hoc tota communitas christianorum semper et ubique tenet et credit et non aliud vel contrarium. Et quicunque in aliquo puncto circa fidem aut veritatem christianam separaret se ab illa ecclesia Romana a communitate christianorum in tenendo et credendo aliud, quam illa ecclesia Romana credit et tenet et illa communitas, ille esset superbus hereticus, quia vellet, quod sua fides in credendo esset verior nedum et melior quam ecclesie Romane et communitatis christianorum. Sed eciam, quod sua fides esset vera et fidelis et e contrario fides ecclesie Romane esset falsa et infidelis. Et quis fidelis christianus videret talem stulticiam et superbiam de se putare?

Quarto quod secundum fidem catholicam credendum est et tenendum, quod ex plena ordinacione spiritus sancti

triplex est ecclesiasticus pastor simplicium ovium Christi in terra. Supremus sicut papa, medius sicut archiepiscopus et episcopus, proprius et infimus sicut rector parrochialis ecclesie, quem communiter dicimus plebanum. Sicut ergo in regno seculari rex in iudicio ex officio suo plus potest ligare et solvere in causis secularibus quam baro regni et baro plus quam miles simplex vel simplex cliens, sic in regno ecclesie spirituali papa sicut summus officialis et iudex eiusdem regni Christi super terram habet totum et plenum posse in omnibus solvendi et ligandi et multo plus quam proprius et inferior episcopus et iterum ille plus quam simplex plebanus seu infimus pastor ovium Christi, etc. Infimi autem simplices sacerdotes extra extremam necessitatem non habent iudicare ligare et solvere et oves commissas illis triplicibus pastoribus preter consensum alicuius illorum trium pastorum. Si enim, quilibet simplex sacerdos, quocunque veniret, haberet iusto iure ligare et solvere in quibuscunque casibus sicut papa episcopus et proprius plebanus, tunc esset inordinatissimum et valde confusum regnum Christi ecclesiasticum in terris. Sic si quilibet simplex cliens in regno Boemie haberet iusto iure iudicare ligare et solvere in quibuscunque causis secularibus, esset regnum nimis confusum et inordinatum; ergo nimis contra ordinacionem Christi et suam ecclesiam ordinatam errant, qui credunt et dicunt, quod quilibet simplex sacerdos tante est potestatis et auctoritatis ad ligandum et solvendum iudicandum et per iudicium puniendum vel penas dimittendum sicut episcopus et papa. Item quia papa habet a Christo potestatem, ut quodcunque solverit vel ligaverit super terram, erit solutum vel ligatum et in celis et quorumcunque remiserit peccata, remittuntur eis, sicut notum est ex ewangeliis sancti Mathei et sancti Iohannis, ideo secundum fidem credi debet, quod papa hominibus vere penitentibus confessis et contritis plenam remissionem peccatorum a pena et a culpa dare potest, sicut si impiissimus iudeus vel paganus cum infinitis nobis turpissimis peccatis mortalibus veniret ad baptismum et non poneret obstaculum baptismi gracie, baptismus sibi deleret omnem penam et culpam illorum peccatorum. Nec debent inferiores papam supremum iudicem in terris diiudicare, quando illam graciam remissionis offert et exhibet

inferioribus, quod ex avaricia vel alia mala causa faciat. Sed per penitenciam confessionem et contricionem humiliter querere petere et pulsare debent, quod gracia talis eis eveniat. Et dato, quod illam non consequerentur, nichil in hoc perdunt, sed magnum lucrum spirituale in tali humilitate previa confessione contricione peticione et pulsacione pro tali gracia consecuntur, etsi dat subsidium et auxilium eciam cum dampno suo pro supremo patri suo spirituali scilicet papa et pro matre sancta Romana ecclesia. Quando hoc bona et pia intencione faciunt, nichil nocet sed multum prodest, eciamsi papa mala intencione quereret pecunias et divicias hominum simplicium.

"Item de quibusdam 45 articulis nichil teneatis, quia in veritate sunt heretici erronei et scandalosi, ita quod eorum nullus est catholicus, sed quilibet est aut hereticus aut erroneus aut scandalosus.

"Item de libris Wikleff sicut de dialogo vel aliis non curetis, quia ibi sunt dogmata contra veritatem christianam catholicam. Sed credatis et teneatis de sacramentis ecclesie, de ordine, de clavibus, de ritibus ceremoniis, de decimis sacrificiis et oblacionibus, sicut creditum et tentum fuit et est per ecclesiam Romanam et per communitatem christianorum publice et expresse priusquam nati sumus.

"Nec hec scribo, ut aliud dignitatem vestram estimem credere aut tenere sed veluti parvulus et ignotus capellanus dominacionis vestre commoneam, ut isto modo secura et tuta teneatis firmissime preciosum et nobilissimum in terris thesaurum fidei catholice supradicte, dum totum illud et non aliud creditis et tenetis circa materiam fidei catholicam et ecclesiam, quam quod per ecclesiam christianam et communitatem Romanam fuit et est publice tentum et creditum. Et quando homo se conformat sic in credendo et tenendo cum Romana ecclesia et communitate christianorum in omnibus terris christianis, tunc impossibile est eum in hoc errare. Alias Romana ecclesia et communitas christianorum in credendo esset erronea. Absit, quod fidelis christianus posset hoc cogitare de matre sua Romana ecclesia aut de matre sua communitate omnium christianorum, etc.

(*E. cod. stud. bibl. Olomuc.* 2, II. 21.)

X.

Revocation of Slanderous Reports against the Wiclifites by Peter of St. Clement, on the 13th March, 1417, in the Collegium Carolinum at Prague.

Revocacio[1] recognicio et protestacio fratris *Petri* sacre theologie professoris, predicatoris monasterii Clementis facta Prage anno domini r417[0] sabbato ante dominica Oculi (March 13) in collegio Karoli coram tota universitate studii Pragensis et in presencia scabinorum et consulum ac communitatum omnium civitatum Pragensium.[2]

(*E cod. univ. Prag. III.* G. 16, fol. 73.)

(Printed in M. M. J. Hus. 1558).

"Coram vobis venerabilibus viris et dominis rectore magistris doctoribus licenciatis baccalariis et studentibus universitatis studii Pragensis et omnibus aliis Christi fidelibus hic presentibus ego frater Petrus de Unyczow ordinis Predicatorum . . . profiteor libera et spontanea voluntate publice et expresse, quod ego male informatus ymmo verius seductus contra legem Dei et sanctorum canonum instituta asserui docui et predicavi in regno Boemie et extra regnum in diversis partibus et presertim in civitate Pragensi, quod tam sacerdotes dantes quam plebei utriusque sexus ab eisdem recipientes venerabile sacramentum corporis et sanguinis domini sub utraque specie panis et vini errarent et errorem committerent et tenerent et si hoc pertinaciter defenderent, essent tamquam heretici puniendi. Que omnia et singula sic per me temerarie stulte et infundabiliter docta asserta et predicata

[1] Above in red letters: "Facta est in collegio magno assistente magna multitudine populi secularium et spiritualium tota universitate Pragensi, magistris civium et iuratis civitatum Pragensium et consilio regis Wenceslai in pavimentis stancium et vulgo in curia."

[2] Over that (in Czech): "Be sensible, little monk; do not run out into the world to lie about the Czechs."

coram vestris venerabilitatibus hic et ex nunc prout ex tunc et ex tunc prout ex nunc publice corde et ore revoco et reclamo asserens nichilominus et profitens corde et ore libere et sponte cum venerabilibus magistris doctoribus baccalariis et studentibus ac communitate huius regni Boemie et presertim huius Pragensis civitatis, quod tam dare quam recipere venerabile sacramentum corporis et sanguinis domini nostri Jesu Christi sub utraque specie panis et vini utriusque sexus hominibus ut prefertur est lex ewangelica, instruccio Christi, doctrina apostolorum et praxis ab observancia ecclesie primitive et concors sanctorum doctorum sentencia et presertim patens et notoria recognicio et professio Constanciensis concilii huic regno Boemie et precipue Luthomislensi episcopo ipsorum legato sub ipsorum bulla patenti transmissa et publicata. Item profiteor publice et expresse libera et spontanea voluntate, quod ego contra legem Dei et dileccionem proximi ex errore in civitate Bononiensi, in civitate Constanciensi et in regno Boemie et aliis terris presertim in civitate Pragensi aperui docui predicavi et publicavi in sermonibus meis licet false et erronee, quod in regno Boemie et signanter in civitate Pragensi pullularunt et succreverunt multi errores et hereses et infecerunt et seduxerunt infinitam multitudinem utriusque sexus, et hoc totum provenit et surrexit ex incauta et erronea predicacione olim pie memorie magistri Iohannis Hus et sibi favencium et adherencium magistrorum doctorum baccalariorum studencium et predicatorum, qui in suis erroribus sequuntur et habent libros quondam magistri Iohannes Wicleff Anglici. Et precipue magistrum Iohannem Hus denunciavi et accusavi in Bononia coram superioribus meis doctoribus magistris et fratribus in monasterio et conventu ad sanctum Dominicum asserens et affirmans stulte et false, quod ipse magister Iohannes Hus et sui fautores ac adherentes in capella Bethleem Prage docuerunt asseruerunt et predicarunt multos errores et hereses et infecerunt et maculaverunt ipsum regnum et civitatem Pragensem et retraxerunt ab obediencia sancte Romane et apostolice ecclesie in sempiternam ipsius regni maculam confusionem atque notam. Ipsumque magistrum Iohannem Hus procurassem citari personaliter ad curiam Romanam, si superiores mei mihi ad ipsum non inhibuissent.

"Item profiteor publice et expresse modo et forma quibus supra, quod ego asserui predicavi et publicavi false et errorice in sermonibus meis in plerisque locis, quod magister Iohannes Hus et sibi adherentes magistri et predicatores moderni ac ceteri vulgares sunt seductores et deceptores populi istius regni et precipue civitatis Pragensis, quodque sunt rami putridi, separati et precisi a sancta Dei ecclesia et communione fidelium et quod tales erronei et seductores de novo colore sic cognoscuntur et cognosi debent, quod habent acutos nasos et palidas facies et sunt clamorosi et ebriosi, currentes ad communionem corporis et sanguinis domini sine omni reverencia et rubore. Sunt enim homines dyabolici, percuciunt homines, longos cultellos portant et occidunt homines sine omni timore. Ideo caveatis vobis cum magna diligencia et studio a talibus predicatoribus et seductoribus, qui ipsi sunt periculosissimi heretici eo, quod sciant suas hereses scripturis false intellectis et glossatis tueri et defensare, quod priores heretici olim hic et in vicinatu combusti nescierunt.

"Quare venerabiles domini magistri doctores etc. premissa omnia et singula sicut iam audistis erronea falsa stulta et scandalosa per me stulte temerarie et erronee asserta, docmatisata predicata et publicata ad dissensiones scismata lites guerras et scandala inter Christi fideles huius regni et civitatis Pragensis generanda, suscitanda ac exteras naciones contra ipsum regnum commovendas et incitandas hic coram vestris venerabilitatibus ex nunc prout ex tunc et ex tunc prout ex nunc publice corde et ore revoco et reclamo asserens et affirmans nichilominus et profitens corde et ore libere ac sponte omnes et singulos utriusque sexus homines, cuiuscunque status dignitatis condicionis gradus religionis vel preeminencie extiterint, christianissimi regni Boemi et presertim venerandos magistros doctores baccalarios et studentes ac predicatores et communitates famosissime et nobilissime civitatis et alme universitatis studii Pragensis fuisse et extitisse, fore et esse bone semper et probate vite ac laudabilis fame ac integri status, sanam et approbatam doctrinam fidei catholice et ewangelice veritatis verbo et opere ac scriptis salubriter predicantes et docentes, errores et hereses ac omnem perversam doctrinam constanter detestando ac sancte Romane et apostolice ecclesie in

omnibus licitis et honestis semper obedientes, ita quod omni tempore, quo in ipso regno Boemie in civitate Pragensi et universitate studii eiusdem conversatus sum et moram traxi, nunquam veridice audivi vel intellexi aliquem viventem hominem tam spiritualem, quam secularem et presertim honorabiles magistrum Iohannem Hus et magistrum Ieronymum de Praga docuisse tenuise legisse predicasse vel asseruisse hereses perversam doctrinam vel quemcunque errorem sed legem Dei ewangelicam et apostolicam ac sanctorum doctorum doctrinam misericordiam et veritatem, caritatem iusticiam atque pacem.

"Idcirco rogo humiliter omnipotentem Deum et dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, ut propter suam magnam misericordiam parcat et indulgeat michi omnia premissa peccata iniquitas et delicta supplicoque instantissime serenissimo principi et domino domino Wenceslao Romanorum regi semper Augusto et Boemie regi[1] . . . , ut omnes et singuli dent et tribuant mihi filio et alumpno ipsorum prodigo veniam et graciam et ad sinum suum et gremium me recipiant graciosius et assumant. Peto quoque cum omni paciencia et humilitate vos venerabilem dominum vicerectorem caput et dominum huius alme universitatis, quatenus graciose et paterne pro predictis stultis temerariis erroneis et scandalosis dogmatisacionibus assercionibus et predicacionibus iniquitatibus et sceleribus mihi penitenciam iniungatis salutarem. Quam cum gaudio volo recipere et subire in futurum bona fide, et omni studio Deo adiuvante promitto a talibus et consimilibus predicacionibus assercionibus erroribus semper dolendo abstinere, protestans publice et expresse, quod si quidquam in futurum publice vel occulte contra premissa docuero asseruero vel predicavero, quod mihi tamquam periuro et in pristinos errores recidivato nulla penitus fides adhibeatur. Ne autem hanc meam protestacionem erogacionem et revocacionem compulsus fecisse videar aut coactus, peto publice dominos notarios hic presentes sponte et libere ipsorum officium invocans, quatenus super premissis omnibus et singulis

[1] The different dignitaries, etc., are again mentioned.

michi unum vel plura publicatum seu publicata conficiatur et faciant instrumentum seu instrumenta.[1]

XI.

A Chronicler's Notice concerning the Ejection from the Windows of the Town Hall at Prague in the Year 1419.

"Anno domini 1419 penultima mensis Julii, que fuit dies dominicus, communitas Wiklefistarum nove civitatis Pragensis hora undecima horologii vel quasi iuratis dicte civitatis bonis christianis in pretorio existentibus pretorium invaserunt et plures in pretorio interficientes de pretorio eiecerunt, ita quod statim ibidem sunt XII. interempti et singulariter ex eo, quod secte Wiklefistarum adherere noluerunt."

(Fuit invol. *Cod.* xxi. 11 *b*, *bibl. cap. Prag.*)

[1] The revocation exists also in Latin and German in some MSS. On this recantation there are to be found two notices in the *Cod. bibl. un. Prag.*, XIV., C. 26: "Item eodem anno feria secunda post Reminiscere Petrus monachus doctor bullatus a S. Clemente stetit in cathedra in scolis universitatis Pragensis et dixit in presencia tocius cleri, quod non est contra communionem calicis et dixit, quod nullum Boemum in suo sermone hereticaret." The second notice declares pretty much the same thing. See *Geschichtschr. der hus. Bew.*, ii. 62. In the *Lit. de civitate Pragensi florenti quondam* (*Ib.*, 317) there is the following observation regarding this *revocacio*: "Nam captivato fratre Petro iam dicto post afflicciones varias unum e duobus eligere coegerunt, ut vel revocet, que contra eosdem magistros vel contra Wicleff Anglicum predicaverat vel in eorum manibus ultimum debitum mortis exsolvat. Pauper homo volens tantam crudelitatem evadere veritatem pluries a se predicatam coram astantibus omnibus in collegio Karoli Prage publice revocavit."

XII.

Invectives against the Wiclifites in Bohemia, of the Time of the Council of Constance.[1]

Missa Wiklefistarum.

(*E Cod. pal. Vindob.* 4941, fol. 262 *a*—263 *b*.)

"Tristabitur iustus et letabitur impius in novi Wikleff solempnitate, qui sepultus extumulatus et combustus in Anglia condempnatur et tamquam Deus in Boemia fideliter adoratur.

"*Versus:* Hus laudem eius et memoriam ad ignem defendere dignatus est, Iessenicz et Koniprus non cessant panyrach (!)[2] die ac nocte. Gloria eorum sit tremor et maledicio in solio patris eorum Wykleph in secula seculorum Amen.

"*Epistola:* Primum quidem sermonem feci de omnibus o Ieronime, que cepit Wiclef facere et docere usque in diem condempnacionis eius. Castigans castigavit corpus eius in oleo et butiro iuxta regnum quod patribus tuis scripsit: *Bibite et inebriamini vino, in quo est luxuria.* Et unusquisque vestrum habeat uxorem suam a sacerdote usque ad laicum: nullus habeat caritatem dei, sed tamquam bestie ambulantes et pro lege naturalem inclinacionem et impetum habeatis. Quis enim similis bestie poterit pugnare contra eam? Sacerdotibus vestris decimare nolite, quia patres presbyteri et episcopi argentum reprobum vocati nec absolvere nec excommunicare possunt. Sed boni laici gladio militant spirit(u)ali, religiosos et dyabolos cappatos diligenter exterminate, sacramenta altaris Christi quilibet vestrum conficere potest. Hec et multa similia locutus sum vobis in enigmatibus,

[1] Nothing is said of the death of Jerome of Prague; that of Hus, on the other hand, is already mentioned.

[2] Thus quite distinctly in the MS. The word was no doubt misread by the transcriber. Corresponds in point of sense to a *pangere*, *predicare*. Whether perhaps a Czechist emendation is possible, I do not venture to decide.

Boemis patribus tuis, et ipsi sequentes sanctum suum impleverunt omnia nec preterit Iota unum.

"O virum malediccione dignum. Hic est draco rufus habens capita septem, hic est vitulus adoratus in Oreb, hic est vere serpens, qui seduxit Adam. Hic est, qui deificat ens antilogum, hic est qui dignificat totam massam universalium, hic est, qui puncta indivisibilia sanctificat, hic est, qui totam scripturam dampnatis erroribus coinquinat hic est, qui diabolo placuit in vita sua et fecit mirabilia pennata. Sed iam Hus regnat et gaudet in dyademate eius, cui sit maledicciо, ve ter novies replicatum in secula seculorum Amen.

"*Sequitur Graduale.* Accedite ad me omnes et facies vestre confundentur. Quidam abierunt retro dicentes: *Durus est hic sermo non possumus audire eum.* Hus vero cum aliis videns spiritum accessit dicens: *Benedic domine plebi tue. Versus:* Accepit malediccionem pro benediccione et gavisus gaudio magno dixit fratribus suis: *Locutus est michi dominus de nubibus celi. Sequitur Alleluia:* Alleluia germinavit spinas et tribulos, flores autem non aperuerunt, ascendit superbia in cor ipsorum et heresis velud pluvia supra singulos eorum.

Sequitur prosa:

"1. Olla mortis ebuliit,
Canina gens esuriit.
Cenam egit et periit
Caterva Boëmorum.
Christi iugum deposuit,
Wykleph sectam elicuit,
Suscepit ille, docuit
Proterva mens eorum.

"2. Verum expertes criminis.
Egenos[1] pravi seminis,
Hos dentes huius carminis
Turbare non aspirant,
Sed mordicant vinee messis
Fel propinantes heresis,
Qui tamquam morbo frenesis
Tacti semper dilirant:

"3. Ut Hus et eius complices
Dantes[2] erroris calices,
Qui circumvenit simplices,
Et nequam Austini.[3]
Knyn, Symon, Iessenicz sequitur,
Demesslik, Habart additur,
Ieronymus non tollitur,
Quamvis addatur frui."

"4. Hii iuramenta prestita,
Olim statuta condita
Dampnantes probant vetita,
Stultorum plebiscita.
De fide pars opposita
Ostendit horum irrita
Sectam et factam credita[4]
Erroribus conditam.

---

[1] In *Cod.*: "Egenus."
[2] *Ib.*: "Dantem."
[3] Named after Austí.
[4] *Ib.*, "creditam."

" 5. Conflabant tunc consilium,
Quo nasceretur prelium
Perdendi omnem filium
Fautorem veritatis.
Et venit execucio
Procedens a principio,
Dedit verum iudicio
Summe probitatis.

" 6. Pars reliqua condoluit,
Quod sic error invaluit.
Exorando redarguit,
Ruinam declaravit.
Sed stantes in malicia,
Nolebant a perfidia
Reduci, fraudis recia
Nec quisquam laniavit.

" 7. Demum triplicia nacio
Vidit, quod obstinacio
Et ultimo dampnacio
Nos undique vallavit.
Viditque grossos improbos
Ad deludendum reprobos,
Extrema soror antropos
Ponens acceleravit.

" 8. Mox dedit se recessui,
Ut desponsatos fastui
Boëmos tantum destrui
Nutando[1] salvaretur.
Nam pluries vicinitas
Confert, quod pene pietas
Res viles et oppositas
Quassare non veretur.

" 9. Fecit, ut mandat sapiens
Nature dux compaciens,
Quod eger inobediens
Omnino reicitur.
Sic torpent in illecebris,
Sic cespitant in tenebris
Et in errorum[2] latebris,
Quis morbo victo medetur?
Amen."

"*Liber generacionis* maledicciones omnium hereticorum filiorum: diaboli filius[3] Wikleph, Wykleph genuit Swevia,[4] Swewia genuit Stanislaum, Stanislaus genuit Hus, Hus genuit Marcum de Grecz, Marcus genuit Sdeniconem, Sdenico genuit Tyssnow, Tyssnow genuit Koniprus, qui fuit nequam quintuplex, Koniprus genuit Michalicz, Michalicz genuit Knyn, qui fuit pater nequicie, Knyn genuit Ieronymun athletam antichristi, Ieronymus genuit Iessenicz usque ac transmigracionem trium nacionum, et post transmigracionem Iessinicz genuit Sdislaum leprosum, cuius contagione infecti sunt multi. Novissime autem temporibus istis non tantum literati fantasticis Wikleph

[1] In *Cod.*, "nutendo, micando?"
[2] *Ib.*, "errorem."
[3] In *Cod.* "filios."
[4] So the MS. has very distinctly. It seems, however, as though SneumaZnaim must be read. In this case Petrus de Znoyma is meant. Only the position is an inverted one. See Hus, *Opp.*, i. 205 *b.* Comp. the genealogical table in Palacky, *Urkundliche Beiträge*, ii. 521.

erroribus insistebant, verum et laici universaliter singuli et singulariter universi.

"*Credo* in Wykleph ducem inferni patronum Boemie et in Hus filium eius unicum nequam nostrum, qui conceptus est ex spiritu Luciperi, natus matre eius et factus incarnatus equalis Wikleph secundum malam voluntatem et maior secundum eius persecucionem, regnans tempore desolacionis studii Pragensis, tempore quo Boemia a fide apostotavit. Qui propter nos hereticos descendit ad inferna et non resurget a mortuis nec habebit vitam eternam. Amen."

"*Sequitur sermo.* Sequitur patrem sua proles. Karissimi, volens antiquis patribus connumerari digne lauream obtinendo debet horum sentencias imitari ore et opere profitendo. Hinc est, quod Wykleph patrem vestrum non videbitis in eternum nisi viam legum eius ambulare curaveritis et approbare iuxta thema "*Sequitur patrem sua proles.*" Sane Wykleph pater vester est. Numquid enim pater vester est, qui creavit et possidet te? Eius supersticiosa vanitas est vobis ewangelium. Eius heretica pravitas est vobis tamquam lac doctrine salutaris. Eius lex et constitucio sunt vobis loco preceptorum Dei. Studeatis ergo vestigia pedum eius sectari, ut de vobis verificetur illud scripture: *Quorum os maledicione et amaritudine plenum est.* Et per vos dicere possitis: *Peccavimus cum patribus nostris iniuste, etc.* Magnificate ab oriente in occidentem nomen eius dicentes: *Non est Deus preter Wykleph Deum nostrum.* Ipse est, qui fecit mirabilia pennata. Glorificate filium eius Hus dicentes: *Inquinate sunt vie illius in omni tempore.* Extollite totam turbam Wiklephistarum dicentes: *Hic est populus perdicionis, gens dure cervicis, conventus malignancium, turba iudeorum, exercitus Pharaonis.* Optetis vobis plagas eiusdem, ut sic aliqualiter expurgati a facie ad faciem mereamini patrem vestrum. Non eciam latere oportet, quod erat principium heresis Boemorum atque cuiuslibet secte. Ergo diabolus suis subditis astutis unam personam bravium tantum aggrediens et persuadens aliquo erroris laqueo involvit et ad ipsum defendendum multipliciter armat. Quo facto eadem persona eiusdem[1] artificis cooperacione aliam inficit et sic commu-

[1] In *Cod.*: "eiasdem."

niter usque quo plures illius[1] fellis gustaverunt et tunc spe multitudinis animati sese manifestant et singulis palam exponunt, quod prius absconditum observabant. Ultimo se fidei fore meliores credentes nituntur contradictores supprimere per potenciam (et) persuasionem terrere vel quomodolibet aliter exterminare. Tunc primo gloriantur adinvencionibus[2] suis, ut putant (se) angelis sancciores. Hoc dico probabiliter tetragram eutropologie. Rursus ad propositum redeundo congratulamini Wikleph hereticum vestrum adorantes; ipse est enim lux oculorum vestrorum et lucerna pedum vestrorum. Vos estis opera manuum suarum, quia circa luciperum genuit vos. Exultate et gaudete: Merces vestra magna est apud eum. Ivit enim parare vobis locum, qui promissus est diabolo et angelis eius. Quare secum gloriantes debent suis doctrinis incessanter insistere contra doctores in fugando iura principum.

"Volens antiquis patribus connumerari condigne lauream obtinendo debet horum sentencias imitari ore et opere perficiendo, ad quod sequitur thema premissum, "*Sequitur*, etc." In quibus verbis proposicione Boemie precursor antichristi Wykleph pater vester tripliciter recolitur: primo doctrine sue vigorositate, quia sequitur: Qui enim aliquid sequitur, vi attrahitur. Secundo in docendi auctoritate, quia patrem: pater filio maior est. Tercio in auditorum disciplinabilitate quoque[3] [sic] proles: Filius enim obediens gaudium matris eius. In primis duobus commendatur ipse Wikleph. Nam eius doctrina fuit efficax et vigoris plena, quod a signo ostendi potest. Tota enim Boemia delirat eius aceto inebriata et (non) solum clerus eius sectam sibi disponit, sed et laicus quilibet aberrat tamquam a vino crapulatus. Unde velud magnes insensibili quadam virtute sibi ferrum attrahit, sic eius doctrina quedam secreta diaboli violencia innumerabiles subvertit, quare dicitur vigorosa iuste. Secundo ex auctoritate docendi recolitur: Fuit enim a diabolo informatus, animatus et approbatus, ut secum dicere dignaretur: Ascendam ad Aquilonem, etc. Vir

[1] In *Cod.*: "illud."
[2] In *Cod.*: "advencionibus."
[3] Recte: "quia."

magnus et autenticus erat, qui magnum luminare diei parvo luminari noctis suppeditavit. Fecit enim papam cesare potestate in omnibus inferiorem et communiter clerum laicatu viliorem, quare autenticus. Tercium convenit vobis: Vos estis enim dispositi ad heresim acceptandam, parati ad exequendum. Quare merito discipuli Wikleph et animosi ymmo pertinaces et obstinati ad defendendum, quare merito discipuli Wykleph dici potestis. Cuius gloria accipiat vos et tribuat vobis omne malum excogitabile nec plus vel minus uni quam alteri, sed equaliter cuilibet summe malum in secula seculorum Amen.

"Amen Amen dico vobis, maledictus a Deo, qui aspernat matrem suam, heresis, qua diabolo regenerati estis, mater vestra est. Exterminate mulierem extraneam, que christianorum fides Dei tamquam adulteram a cubilibus vestris, dicit Wykleph Deus vester.

"Planctus planctus planctus canimus: Wykleph Scarioth pleni sunt celi et terra heresi tua. O sedes in profundis, maledictus qui venit in nomine diaboli. O sedes in profundis.

"Magne Dei oblatrator, qui colis peccata mundi, dona Boemis requiem tuam sempiternam.

"Omnipotens sempiterne Deus: Fac Wikleph solemnitatem fideliter peragentes nec non secum in fide communicantes eius gloria participes, etc. . . . Per dominum."

"Ite maledicti, missa est. Deo gracias."

SUPPLEMENTARY.

At the Introduction is further to be mentioned the book of Vlach, *Die Czechoslaven* (Vienna and Teschen 1883). The most important passage bearing on the present subject is: "Although Hus and his friends rejected the doctrine of Wycliff, preaching was nevertheless interdicted to them, and they were placed under the ban."

For the first and second chapters, Mencik's work: Nekolik statutů a narizení arcibiskupu prazskych Arnosta a Jana, I. (*Abh. der kön. böhm. Ges. der Wissenschaften.* Sixth series, vol. ii.) together with his study on Konrad of Waldhausen (see above, p. 302), affords some important particulars. A few documents of the latter dissertation likewise relate to Adalbertus Ranconis.

To p. 66. A passage of a hitherto unprinted writing of Johannes of Schweidnitz reads: "Quantum ad primum, notandum, quod predicti adversarii et presumptores de anno domini 1420 sexto die mensis Iulii apud eos multum celebri et festivo in recordacionem dampnate memorie, quondam Iohannis Hus heresiarche et seductoris ipsorum, quorum memoria in malediccione est et finis sine honore . ." *Cod. pal. Vind.* 4151 (fol. 51 *a*—146 *a*).

To pp. 82—85. In the years 1414—1419 there is mention made, in official deeds proceeding from the Catholic side, only of Wiclifists. Very instructive in this respect is that deed which is presented in the eleventh book of the *Libri erectionum* as the testament of Adam of Nezeticz, canon of Prague. He bequeaths considerable legacies to ecclesiastical dignitaries in Prague, but adds: "Suspectus de secta Wiclefistarum non eligatur." See Balbin, *Miscell.*, dec. i., lib. 5, 220, 221. He bequeaths likewise his collection of books: "Reliqui libri super sacristiam ipsius

ecclesie Pragensis usibus reserventur et concedantur, sed nulli Wiclephiste aut suspecto." The will was attested before the notary on the 18th July, 1419.[1]

As in these documentary monuments, so also in the questions of the Inquisition, which were proposed to the Hussites, it is Wiclifists who are spoken of. "Secuntur interrogaciones, quibus interrogentur Wiclifiste, et responsiones eorum et soluciones ad eorum responsiones." See *Cod. pal. Vind.* 4941, fol. 248 *a*. Also in the midst of the text: "Undecima interrogacio: queratur a Wiclefistis . . ." This tractate was written in 1431: "Finitus est tractatulus in Diewin anno domini 1431 sexta feria ante Fabiani et Sebastiani martyrum." The matter itself is of earlier origin, as is shown by the following proposition: "Item posiciones posite simpliciter contra Wiclefistas cum questionibus et responsionibus." In the same MS., fol. 252 *a b* and 270 *b*, as Posiciones de Constancia.

To p. 79. Stephen of Palecz speaks, in a dissertation (as yet unprinted) *De communione sacramenti sub utraque specie* (*Cod. pal. Vind.* 4941, fol. 111 *a*, sqq.) repeatedly of the Wiclefists: "Impugnatur ergo ecclesia moderno tempore maxime ab hereticis nove secte Wyclefistis . . . Soli autem Wiclefiste de nacione Boemorum scissi sunt ab unitate bene credencium . . . Claudant ergo illam portam inferni Wiclefiste . . . Ideo Wiclefiste predicacionem suam dixerunt predicacionem esse verbi Dei . . . Sed dicit Wyclefista." . . . Only in two passages is Taborenses added: "Wyklefiste seu Taborenses; Wyklefiste et Taborenses."

The expression "Hussita" is also to be met with in this tractate; but only in the introductory part thereof, which does not proceed from the pen of Palecz.

Likewise in the "Replicacio Quidamistarum de stilo magistri Stephani Palecz" (*Cod. pal. Vind.* 4308 and *Cod. un Prag.* XI. E. 3) it is of Wiclefists we hear speak: "Qui tamen magni" — it is said there of Palecz and his companions

[1] Balbin observes on the testament: "Adamus de Nezeticz decretorum doctor et multis annis vicarius generalis archiepiscorum quasi providens religionis mutacionem in Bohemia futuram Wiclefistas ab omni parte sue hereditatis excludit."

—"sunt inimici Wiclefistarum et Wiclefiste ipsorum econtra." This *replicacio* belongs to the year 1415: "Scriptum Constancie anno domini 1415 circa vel prope festum sancti Viti."

Not otherwise is the usage in the *Responsio dominorum doctorum* of Palecz; assuming that this latter is not, as I suspect, identical with the preceding writing (*Cod. Treb.* A. 16). I have not hitherto been able to institute a comparison of the two. As regards Stanislas of Znaim, it suffices to mention his celebrated writing, *Alma et venerabilis facultas*, etc., which Hus attempted to refute in his dissertation, *Ad scripta Stanislai.* The very title reads: "Sequitur responsio contra posicionem Wiclefistarum." . . Of test-passages only a few need here be adduced: "Fictus autem ille clerus ewangelicus non volens fateri sentencias Wyklef contrarias esse et falsas, repugnat in hoc." In this manner he always speaks of the dogmas of Wiclif: "Sed malicia et erroneus affectus ad sentencias erroneas Wyklef de hoc sacramento cecavit eos." . . . Upon the position of Stanislas towards the doctrines of Wiclif and his relations to Hus, this tractate casts a strong light. The said pamphlet may perhaps be published within a short time. In consideration of this fact any lengthy extracts in this place may well be dispensed with. On the relation of Hus to Stanislas there is to be found the following passage in the work of Andreas de Broda, "Contra obiectus Husonitarum" (*Cod. pal. Vind.* 4941, fol. 68): "O Hus . . . si tibi displicet discoopercio tui facinoris, cur patri tuo non parcis? Eius verecundiam detegis. Cur magistro tuo, a quo plurimam hausisti sapienciam, irrogas tantum malum? Sequaris pocius eius vestigia." . . .

In the *Cod.* 49 of the library in Hohenfurt is a "Prophecia magistri Theoderici . . . de Wiclefistis sub utraque specie sumentibus . . ."

In the writings against the well-known four articles of Prague, Wiclifists in like manner are spoken of, and this at the beginning of the third decade of the century; comp. "Tractatus Wiklefistarum presentatus per eos serenissimis principibus regi Polonie et magno duci Lytwanie," *Cod. bibl. stud. Olomuc*, 2, ii. 21. In the tractate itself there is employed besides the word Wiclefiste, likewise the word Hussite.

To p. 86. That which Peter Chelcicky says on Wiclif, is the subject treated in the extracts made by Goll from Chelcicky's writings; comp. *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der böhmischen Brüder*, ii. 72.

"Not long ago," it is said, "one who has listened to you taught us what you believe, and that all which you advance about the signs, you draw from Wiclif, out of his two books on the body of Christ . . . Johannes Hus (and) magister Jacobell understood Wiclif better than other Bohemians . . .

"I believe that must be pleasant to you, as salt in the eyes. For, seeing you mainly rest on Wiklef, I have taken it out of Wiklef, etc." . . . p. 83: "Since thou (Rokyzana) allegest Wiklef, and no other doctor, as thy teacher, thou seemest to set a higher estimate upon him than upon others. . . . Of a truth I esteem Wiklef chiefly because I hear of him, that no one among the ancient doctors, or those of the present day, has so well spoken and written against the poison which has been infused into the Holy Church . . . Wiklef has also torn out his sectaries by the root," etc.

Of foreign historians the Pole Dlugosch is yet to be cited This writer, on the authority, it would seem, of Silesian sources, relates the history of the penetration of Wiclifism into Bohemia, after the manner of the last named, although not without some modifications; comp. lib. 10, edition of *Przezdziecki*, tom. x. 501: "Hussitarum secte origo in Bohemia per Iohannem Huss, qui heresim Wikleph Prage excitavit." Comp. 502; tom. xiii. of the complete edition, 183—185, 234—236.

INDEX.

Abraham, see "Nicholas of Welemowitz"
Adalbertus Ranconis [d. 1388], 38-42, 44, 51, 59, 67, 70, 302--304, 354
Adam of Nezeticz, 354
Agram, 166
Ailli (or Ailly), Card. d', xxxii, 174, 181
Alanus [d. abt. 1203], 60
Albano, Card. de, 35
Albert (Albrecht) of Bavaria, 302
Albert of Wayzow, 9
Albik of Uniczow, Archbp., 139, 143, 145, 150, 157
Alexander V., Pope [1409, 1410], 114—118, 128
Amandus, Magister, 60
Ambrose, 60
Anacletus, 61
Andreas of Brod, 33, 68, 77, 109
Andreas of Regensburg (Ratisbon) on the Relation of Hus to Wiclif, xlvi
Anne of Luxemburg, Queen of Richard II. [14th Jan., 1382—7th June, 1394], 70, 71, 136, 261, 262
Anselm, 60, 326, 331, 333
Antonio of Monte Catino, 129
Apollinaris, 332
Aristotle, 321, 323
Arnest of Pardubitz and the Bohemian Church, 1—20, 255, 302
Arnobius [close of centy. 3], 332
Articles, The Forty-Five, 75, 97—100, 143, 152, 153, 159, 160
Arundel, Thomas, Count, Archbp., 164
Augustine,[1] xxii, xxxvi, 60, 323—326, 331
Austi, see John of Austi
Austini, 349
Averroes [d. 1198], 321
Avicenna [d. 1037], 321

Balbin, View of, on the Diffusion of Wiclify in Bohemia, xix
Balthasar Cossa (afterwards John XXIII.), 107
Basle, Council of [assembled 1431], 62
Bavarians, Campaign against the, 89
Bede, 24
Benedict XII. [1336—1342], 6
XIII. [from 1394], 107
Benesch of Chobolicz, 305
of Weitmühl, 33, 305
Benessius, prædicator, 337—339
Beneschau, Visitation of the Deanery of, 298—300
Berengarius of Tours [d. 1088], 120
Berlin, Adulterator of Saffron in Prague, 97
Bernard of Clairveaux, xxxvi, 60
Bernau, 169

[1] Citations from the texts of Wiclif or Hus are omitted.

Bethlehem, Chapel of, 40, 68, 69, 116, 145, 157, 247
Biridamistæ, 331
Bishop-Teinitz, 34
Boethius [d. 526], 326
Bohemia, Number of Churches and Villages in, at Beginning of the Fifteenth Century, 295
Bohunco, Vicar of Swagerzicz, 17
Bologna, 6, 128, 344
Bonaventura, Magister [d. 1274], 60
"Book of Visitation" for the Diocese of Prague, 14, 295, 301
Bradwardine, Thomas [d. 1349], xv
Brancas, Card., 145
Breslau, 36
Brewnow, 41
Abbot of, 306

Cæsarius of Arles [d. 542], 60
Cambridge, 134
Cancellaria Arnesti, 8
Carthusians, 95
Cassianus [centy. 5], 60
Charles IV., Emperor, K. of Bohemia [1347—1378], 1—7, 22, 32, 35, 42, 67, 91, 261, 302
Christian of Prachatitz, 94, 98, 156, 157, 257, 258
Church, Possessions of the Bohemian, 5
Clemengis (or Clemangis), Nicholas of [wrote his indictment of the papacy 1402—1409], xxxiii
Clement VI., Pope [1342—1352] 6, 7
Clergy, Accusation by the Bohemian, 87, 152
Cobham, Lord, 64
Cochlæus, on the Diffusion of Wiclify in Bohemia, xviii, 73
Colonna, see "Otto"
Communio, see "Supper"
Concubinage of the Clergy, 16—19
Conflict, between the Reason and the Conscience, Tractate on the, 58
Conrad, see "Konrad"
Constance, Council of, xxxix 19, 70, 74, 101, 134, 161, 163, 164—177, 181, 344
Cracow, 36
Crisarius, 60
Crusades against Ladislas, King of Naples, Bull for the, 139

Damascenus, John, 331
Daniel, Minorite [Franciscan] Friar, 59
Demesslik, assecla Hus, 349
Dionysius, 326
Dlugosch on the Relation of Hus to Wiclif, 357
Dolein, see "Stephen"
Dubravius on the Diffusion of Wiclify, xviii
Duns Scotus [d. 1308], xv

Eliæ, Magister, see "John"
Enea Silvio [afterwards Pius II., d. 1464], on the Relation of Hus to Wiclif, xvi
on the Inroads of Wiclify into Bohemia, 71—73
England, 70, 102, 322
Ernest, Duke of Austria, 146

Fabian, Pope [d. 250], 61, 355
Faulfisch, see "Nicholas"
Fitz, Richard, 126—128
Franciscus of Heiligenkreuz in Breslau, 57
Fridmann of Bilin, 305
Friedrich, on the Relation of Hus to Wiclif, xxxiii, xxxiv

Gallus, Abbot of Königsaal, 60
Gelasius I., Pope [d. 496], 288
George of Kynehnicz, 101
George of Podiebrad, King [1458—1471], 72, 88
Germans at the University of Prague, 91
in the Civic Council, 161, 162
Departure of the, 110
Gerson, Jean de, xxxii, 166
Gottfried of Weisseneck, Bishop of Passau, 302

Gratian [first half of centy. 12], xxxv
Gregory, St. [d. 604], xxxvi
Gregory XII. [1406—1409], 107, 108, 138, 310
Grossetête ("Robertus Lincolniensis" [d. 1253]), xxii, 272, 326
Habart, assecla Hus, 349
Hajek of Liboczan, on the Diffusion of Wiclify in Bohemia, xviii, 74
Hartung van Clux [? a Fleming], Ambassador of Henry IV. of England, 134, 135
Hassek, Dean, 305
Hatred between Germans and Czechs, 112, 113
Henry IV. of England, 65, 134
V. of England, 65
Henry Lefl of Lazan, 163, 167
of Chlum, 169
of Oyta, 38
of Virneburg, 6
Henning Baltenhagen, 110
Heretics in Bohemia, 11, 16, 17, 154
Herspruck, 162
Hilary, 331
Hraban [d. 856], 24
Horlean, Johannes, 56
Hungary, 102
Hus,[1] Johannes of Husynec,
Day and Year of his Birth, 65—71, 354
Learning of, xxii, xxxv, xxxvi
Influence of Janow upon, 47
As a Teacher, 81, 82
Dignities and Offices of, 68
Patriotism, 91, 92
Relations with Palecz and Stanislas of Znaim, 94, 142, 156
as a Synodal Preacher, 95, 96
in University Matters, 107—110
on the Indulgence, xxxii, xxxvi, 134—149
under Excommunication, 130
Hus, Appeal of, 115, 116
His Adherents, 125—133
Summoned to Rome, 129, 146—148
in Exile, 148, 150—163
at Constance, 165—177
Revered as a Martyr, 66, 176, 354
Defends Works of Wiclif, xxv, 121, 144, 235, 254, 308
Condemnation of his Writings, 175, 176
Views on the Relations of Hus to the Doctrines of Wiclif, xv—xlvii, 280—291
Works of:—
"Ad scriptum octo doctorum," 220, 285
"Contra occultum adversarium," 137
"Contra Palcez," xxvii, 157, 158 173, 213
"Contra Stanislaum," xxvii, 157, 158 173, 213, 219
"De ablacione temporalium," 225—235
"De arguendo clero," 104
"De corpore Christi," 286—288
"De corporis et sanguinis sacramento," 287—289
"De credere," 148, 157, 247—250
"De ecclesia," xxvii, 151—157, 172—174, 181—224, 251, 256, 263, 264, 267, 269—272, 284
"De fidei sue elucidacione," 171, 248, 249, 252, 279, 284, 285
"De imaginibus," 265, 266
"De indulgenciis," 140, 236—246
"De omni sanguine glorificato," 103
"De oracione dominica," 255, 256
"De pace," 171, 274—279

[1] We can here refer to those places alone which are of greatest importance. In connection with Bk. II. allusion is made only to Hus' own writings. The names of authors cited by him are here passed over. See preceding note.

Hus, "De remanencia (?) panis," 136
"De sex erroribus," 157, 247—251
"De simonia," xxv, 157
"De sufficiencia legis," 170, 171, 279
"De tribus dubiis," 138, 139, 248
"Sermons," 220—222, 252, 259, 260

Images and Relics, Veneration of, 49
Indulgence Granted for the Year 1393, 51, 52
Indulgences, Controversy on, in Prague, of the Year 1412, 134—148
Innocent III. [1198—1216], 71, 290
IV. [1243—1254], 272
VI. [1352-62], 7
VII. [1404-6], xlii, 103

Jacob of Mies (Jacobellus, Jakoubek), 36, 82, 122, 144, 154, 158, 308
Jacob of Wischegrad, 157
Jacobus de Taramo, 118
Jankow the Mathematician, 67
Janow, Mathias of, xxi, xxx, xlvii, 33, 36, 43—51, 54, 55, 61—63, 76, 305, 306
Wenceslas of, 305, 306
Janowitz, George Burkhard of, 18
Paul of, 296, 300, 305
Jaroslaw of Sarepta, 114
Jerome, 61, 332
Jerome of Prague, 71, 74, 75, 141, 162, 175, 349, 350
Jerusalem, 147
Foundation in Prague, 35
Jinoch, Canon, 114
Jirsik, see "George of Podiebrad"
Jodok, Margrave of Moravia, 95, 116
Johannes Cardinalis of Reinstein, 107
of Duba, 86
Eliæ, 109, 157, 159
of Giczin, 125, 308, 334, 335
Johannes Hofmann of Schweidnitz, 354
Hübner, 97—99
Kbel, 97
Peklo, 125, 335
Preacher of the Germans, 37
Presbyter, 17
of Pribram, xv, 80—82
of Rokyzan, 62, 357
of Stekno, 51, 52, 67, 77
Sybort, 162, 165
of Thomariis, 130
Vicarius, 306
Johannes Welflini of Pomuk (John of Nepomuk), 96
Handicraftsman, 143
Johl of Pisek, 16
John XXIII., Pope [1410—1415], 115, 128—133, 137, 145, 148, 155, 164, 168
John Chrysostom, 105
Ocko of Wlaschim, Archbp., 11, 13—16, 36
of Chlum, 167, 169
of Gaunt (Ghent), 271
of Jenzenstein, Archbp., 13, 14, 39, 40, 44, 48, 70, 306
of Jesenic, 94, 129, 144, 147, 158, 168, 349, 350
of Königgrätz, 305
of Leitomischl, 151, 155
of Padua, 9

Karlstein, 131
Katharina of Krawar, 160, 339—342
Knyn (or Knin), see "Mathias"
Koniprus,, 350
Konrad of Vechta, Archbp. [d. 1426], 151, 155, 166, 168
Vicar, 306
of Waldhausen [d. 1369], xxv, xxvi, 21—31, 32, 33, 35, 51, 77, 302—304
Kozi hrádek, near Austi, 156, 163
Krakowec, in the district of Rakonitz, 163
Kravar, Lacek of, 129, 131
Kreuz (Crux, Kriz), 40, 51, 336
Kunesch of Trebowel, 39, 103

Kunz of Zwola, 79
Kuttenberg, 108

Lacek, see "Kravar"
Lactantius, 319
Ladislas, King of Naples, 137, 138, 139—142
Lancaster, Accession of the House of, 64
Lauf, 169
Lechler, Edition of Wiclif's Works, xvii
on the Relation of Hus to Wiclif, xli, xlii
Lefl, see "Henry"
Leghorn (Livorno), 107
Leitomischl, 8, 132
Lewis, Emperor [1314—1347], 6
of the Palatinate, Elector, 84
"Liber confirmationum et erectionum," 10
"Libri visitationum," 14, 17
Extracts from the, 295—301.
Lodi, 165
London, Synod of (17th May, 1382), xliv, 97
Ludolph Meistermann, 98
of Sagan, 3, 71, 77, 85, 99, 137, 165
Luther, xxxiv, 66

Marek (Marcus) of Konigrätz, 144, 350
Martin, Disciple of Hus, 68, 169
Handicraftsman, 143
of Miliczin, 145
of Olmütz, 305, 306
Mathæus of Cracow, xxxii, 57—59
Mathias of Janow, see "Janow"
of Knin, 105, 350
of Leitmeritz, 305
Presbyter, 17
Mauritius Rawaczka, 107
Mendicant Friars, Controversy with the, 22, 32, 303, 304
Michael of Deutschbrod, 144, 145, 170
of Malcinitz, 165
Michalicz, 350
Miliczius (Milicz, d. 1374) of Kremsier, xxv—xxviii, xxx, xxxi, 22, 31, 33—37, 42, 46, 51, 60, 77
"Missa Wiclefistarum," 348—353
Mühlheim, John of, 40, 51, 336

Neander, on the Relation of Hus to Wiclif, xxi—xxiii
on Janow, 45
Neustadt, 169
Nicholas Biceps, 67
Faulfisch, 72, 101, 102
of Leitomisch, 67, 94, 97
of Lobkowitz, 109
of Miliczin, 145
Bishop of Nazareth, 168
Puchnik, 96
Rachorowitz, 67
Tempelfeld, 72, 86, 177
of Troppau, Duke, 7
of Welemowitz, 104
Zul of Ostredek, 89
Nominalists at the University, 92, 94
Novatus, 332
Nuremberg, 170

Occam (or Ockham), William [d. 1347], xv
Occamistæ, 331
Oldcastle, Sir John, see "Cobham"
Olmütz, 8, 10, 36
Origen, 321, 332
Orosius [beginning of fifth cent.], 331
Otto of Colonna, Cardinal, 128, 131, 145
Oxford, xxiv, 41, 69—73, 93, 101, 102, 135, 329

Palecz, Stephen, see "Stephen"
Paris, University of, 41—43, 69, 70, 110, 136, 166, 306
Pater, see "Mathias of Knin"
Paul, St., 61
Paul of Janowitz, see "Janowitz"
of Slawikowitz, 120
Payne, Peter [d. 1455], xxiv, 72
Peter of Chelczicky, 357
of Krawar, 160

Peter of Mladenowitz, 101
of Mukarzew, 17
Lombard [d. about 1164], 289
Stefaneschi, Cardinal, 145
Petrus Stupna, 67
Peter of Uniczow, Revocation of, 343—347
Peter of Znaim, 94, 157, 159, 350
Picards, 120
Pileus de Prata, Cardinal, 42
Pisa, Council of [1409], 109
Plato, 323, 325, 326
Podhradensis, Visitation of the *Decanatus P.*, 297, 298
Potenstein, Lords of, 129
Prague, Seat of Wiclify, xxiv, 100—103, 148
Civic Council of, 130, 161, 162
Metropolitan See of, 6, 7, 36
University of, 38, 69, 92, 101, 102, 108, 120, 155, 173, 324
Premysl Ottokar I., 6
"Przibico decanus," 305
Przibislas of Horowitz, 305
Pribram, see John of "Pribram"
Procopius notarius, on the Diffusion of Wiclif's writings in Bohemia, 73
Prokop of Pilsen, 94, 144, 308, 317—328
Pürglitz, 39

Quidamists, 157

Realists at the University of Prague, 92, 94, 121
Relics, Veneration of, 49, 50
"Remanentia panis," 52, 53
Richard II. of England, 70, 136, 261
Richardus de St. Victore, 289
Rohle, Wenzel, xxxii, 52
Rokyzan, John of, 62
Rome, 147
Rosenberg, Lords of, 22
Rudolph IV., Duke of Austria, 32
Rudolph of Saxony, Elector, 131
Rupert, King [Emperor, 1400—1410], 57, 106

Saaz, Burghers of, 302, 303
Sacraments ("De septem sacramentis et de eucharistia"), 60
Sander, Official in Olmütz, 61
Seneca, 320—322, 326, 328, 330
Sigismund, Emperor [1411—1437], xxv, 70, 83, 84, 96, 132, 134, 161, 164, 169, 174
Simon de Cassia, 60
of Gistebnitz, 73
notarius, 306
of Tissnow, 94, 122—124, 158, 308, 309—316
of Rheims, Cardinal, 166
"Smilo sacrista," 306
Sophia, Queen of Wenzel, 83 n., 106 n., 129
Stanislas of Welwar, 72
of Znaim, 67, 94, 97, 98, 100, 104, 107, 142, 143, 146, 151, 153, 156—161, 209, 213, 219, 339—342, 350
Handicraftsman of Prague, 143
State of the Clergy in Bohemia, 3—20
Statutes of Arnest of Pardubitz, 8—10
Stekno, see "Johannes"
Stephen of Dolein, 78, 79, 85, 90, 93, 95, 117
of Kolin, 67
of Palecz, 67, 68, 94, 98—101, 107, 108, 131, 142, 145, 151, 153, 156, 161, 170, 209, 213
of Prague, 19
Stibor, Vayvode of Transylvania, 131
Stitny, Thomas [d. about 1400], 38—43, 75, 76, 94
Stokes, John, xvii, 70, 86, 93, 101, 102, 134—136, 174, 261, 272
Sulzbach, 169
Supper, The Lord's, Frequent Reception of the, xxxi, 49
Under two forms, see "Ultraquism"
Controversy, The First, on the, xxxi, 55—63
Synod of Prague, 50, 168

Tabor, 162
Terminists, see "Nominalists"
Theobald, Zacharias, on the Relation of Hus to Wiclif, xviii
Thomas de Aquino [d. 1274], 60, 288, 326
Thomas à Kempis [d. 1471], 43
Thomas Netter of Walden, 65
Thomas of Stitney, see "Stitney"
Tranquillius, Epistle of Jerome to, 332
Transylvania, 102

Urban V. [1362—1370], 35, 302
Urban VI. [1378—1389], 57, 305, 306
Utraquism, xxxi, 54 note[1], 79

Veit (Vitus), St., Church of, 33, 51
Venedig, Foundation in Prague, 35
Vienna, 165
Villani, 4, 7
Visitation, Festival of the [instituted by Urban VI.], 39

Weiglinus, Minorite Friar, 302
Wendelar of Heiligenkreuz, 57
Wenzel (Wenceslas), King of Bohemia [d. 1419], 4, 39, 51, 70, 88, 89, 96, 106—109, 114, 116, 126, 129—132, 137, 139, 142, 143, 144, 152, 154, 157, 161, 311
Wenzel of Bechin, 97
Prebendary, 306
of Duba, 167, 169
of Kommotau, 17
Rohle, xxxii, 52
Tiem, 139, 170
Wessenberg on the Relation of Hus to Wiclif, xxviii
Wiclif, John [1324—1384], Last Years of, 64
After Influence of, 65, 119, 120
Doctor Ewangelicus, 322
No Nominalist, xxvii
Regarded in Bohemia as a Fifth Evangelist, xv
Doctrine of, Condemned, 172
Wiclif, Works of:—
Doctrine of the Supper, xxiv, 75, 98, 99, 105, 172, 248
On Indulgences, 236—246
"Alithia," see "Trialogus"
"De absolucione a pena et a culpa," 119, 141, 236, 242—244, 271
"Ad argumenta cuiusdam emuli," 119, 267, 268
"De attributis," 115, 331
"De Christo et suo Adversario," 119, 191, 194, 210, 214—223, 244, 245, 252, 257, 260, 268, 278, 285
"De citacionibus frivolis," 270
"De corpore Christi," 105, 115
"Cruciata," 141
"Decalogus," 115, 122, 308, 309
"Dialogus," 105, 115, 146, 208, 236, 245, 284, 312
"De dissensione paparum," 119
"De dominio civili," 115
"Super Ewangelia," 115, 171
"De fide catholica," 119, 194
"De fratribus dyscolis," 115
"De hypotheticis," 115
"De ideis," 115
"De imaginibus," 119, 265—267
"De incarnacione verbi divini," 115
"De materia et forma," 115
"De officio pastorali," 284
"De officio regis," 119, 137, 268, 269, 285
"De oracione dominica," 254, 255
"De ordinibus ecclesie," 119, 256, 257
"De prevaricacione," 270
"De probacione proposicionum," 115, 122, 309—316
"Questio ad fratres," 247, 248, 249
"De Septem donis Spiritus sancti," 278
"Sermones," 252, 271, 274—278, 285, 286, 311
"De Simonia," 115, 234, 249, 251, 311

Wiclif, Works of—
"Trialogus" [first printed at Basle, 1525], xviii, 95, 96, 105, 115, 137, 146, 210, 216, 222, 234, 239, 245, 260, 278, 284—287, 312
"De Trinitate," 115
"De triplici vinculo amoris," 119, 136, 260—262
"De universalibus realibus," 115, 122, 253, 331
"De vanis religionibus monachorum," 223, 278
"De veritate scripture," 255, 285, 333
"De ypocritis," 331
Doctrine of Predestination, 46, 46, 96, 185, 210
Burning of the Books of, 112—126, 307
Influence of, upon Hus, xv—xlvii
Significance of, for the Reformation of the 16th centy., xxxviii
Wiclifism in Bohemia, xlii, 64—111, 150—163
Condemnation of, 164—177
Wiclifites and Hussites, 82—87
William of Lestkow, 7
Wilsnack, Wonder-Working Blood at, 102
Wlaska, Adulterator of Saffron, 97
Wok of Waldstein, 142
Wolfram of Skworec, Archbp., 89, 96

Zbinco of Hasenburg, Archbp. [d. 1411], 18, 89, 95, 97, 100, 103—108, 113—125, 128—133, 139, 153, 159, 273, 307, 311, 314, 329
Zdenko of Labun, 157, 158, 159, 350
Zdislas of Wartenberg, called *of Zwerzeticz*, 122, 124, 125, 144 308, 328—334, 350
Zebrak, Negotiations at, 86, 144
Znaim, see "Stanislas"

Printed by Hazell, Watson, and Viney, Limited, London and Aylesbury.

Date Due		
JU 25 '4[illegible]	[illegible]	
Ja 30 '48	[illegible]	
AP 10 '48	[illegible]	
FE [illegible] 5[illegible]	[illegible]	
FE 20 5[illegible]		
JA 24 '52		
DE 10 '52		
JA 5- '53		
JA 20 '53		
FE 3 '53		
[illegible]		
[illegible]		
OCT [illegible]		
[illegible]		
APR [illegible]		
[illegible]		
JUN [illegible] 1980		

BW6262 .L875
Wiclif and Hus.
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00148 5277